

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



600099340V

THE
THREE TRIBUNALS;
OR, THE
Vicarious Justification of Sinners
IN CHRIST,
SCRIPTURALLY VINDICATED AND PROVED.

BY THE
REV. ROBERT FITZGERALD COLLIS,
RECTOR OF KILCONNELL.

"While we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us."—Rom. v. 8.
"That we might know the things that are *freely* given to us of God."
1 Cor. ii. 12.



DUBLIN:
JOHN ROBERTSON, 8 GRAFTON-STREET.
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., LONDON.
JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER, EDINBURGH.

MDCCCLVI.

110. a. 39.

TO THE ELECT OF GOD,
TO THE SANCTIFIED BY THE HOLY GHOST,
OR
TO ALL THAT LOVE THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IN SINCERITY,
This Volume,
AS EMBRACING THE VINDICATION OF A DOCTRINE SO FREE, SO GRACIOUS,
SO SOUL-SUPPORTING, SO SOUL-ENCOURAGING,
AS THAT OF THE
VICARIOUS JUSTIFICATION OF SINNERS IN CHRIST,
Is Dedicated
BY THEIR
FAITHFUL AND AGED BROTHER IN THE LORD,

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface	vii
Introduction	1

SECTION I.

JUSTIFICATION BY GRACE.

Threefold distinction of justification—The three tribunals—First tribunal, that of God's holiness and justice—What is to plead for us at this tribunal—Gal. iii. 20 explained—Vicarious fall in Adam—Ninth Article—Rom. v. 12-21—Adam appointed the radix, or federal head of mankind—Proof of, viz., in the case of infants—From the afflictions, and evil nature incident to believers—From the immaculate conception of Christ—Illustrations from members of parliament, &c.—Parallelism between Adam and Christ—Seventeenth Article—Two natures in the believer, illustration of—Doctrine of election and predestination—Difference between the former and those of fatalism and philosophical necessity—Illustrations, the tabernacle and the temple—Five blessed results of the doctrine of vicarious justification—Five objections against it answered	15
---	----

SECTION II.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

The second tribunal, that of the believer's consciousness and inward experience—Three witnesses plead for us at this bar—Difference between justification by grace and by faith—Objections taken against the
--

	Page
Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith <i>only</i> —Arguments in favour of the doctrine of vicarious justification—Seven canons of interpretation—The Lutheran view opposes these—The vicarious view coincides with all of them—Threefold Scriptural view of the office of faith in justification—Four different specimens of the right interpretation of faith—Several objections brought against the view here given—These answered—Several benefits of the same	105

SECTION III.

JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS.

The third tribunal, that of the world—What witnesses will plead for us at this bar—Neither faith, nor repentance, nor Christ's righteousness will answer here—Works, the only witness—What kind of works—	
Old scholastic threefold definition of justification.	269
Recapitulation	283
Conclusion	317
Notes	327

P R E F A C E.

IN the year 1378, a meeting took place at the monastery of Blackfriars, in London, composed of eight bishops, fourteen doctors of law, and six of divinity, with fifteen friars and four monks, forming, in all, a council of forty-seven great men, to consider how they would put down certain opinions which were hateful to them, and prosecute the people who were suspected of holding them. To this council John Wickliffe was summoned. He was then fifty-four years of age; and he was accused, before it, for having been preaching the doctrine of free grace at Oxford. It seems that he had been employed, for a considerable time, in refuting the errors of the friars before the magnates of the great scholars of the university. He seems also to have been, what is termed, a popular preacher, having had great success and favour with the lower orders; amongst whom he went by the title of the "Gospel Doctor," and for whose benefit, more especially, he began his most celebrated work, and that which made him receive the noble appellation of the "Morning Star of the Reformation." Whilst thus engaged in promulgating the grace of the Gospel of his Saviour, Wickliffe is suddenly ordered to appear to answer the charges brought against him before the above-named formidable tribunal, at the head of which presided William Courtney, the then Archbishop of Canterbury.

Whilst the trial was proceeding, it is recorded that London was visited with three severe shocks of earthquake, which so shook the house in which Wickliffe's judges and accusers were assembled, that these conscience-smitten men, becoming so terrified for their own personal safety, expected, every moment, to be overwhelmed with the ruins of the edifice, which appeared shaken to its very foundation; whilst some of them interpreting the earthquake as a kind of divine interposition, wished to set the prisoner free. But their president, Archbishop Courtney, declared that it "needed an earthquake of opinion and a violent struggle to be made by the Roman Church, to remove such teachers as John Wickliffe." Whereupon the meeting proceeded, and condemned all his opinions, declaring that he should certainly not be permitted to preach them any more. Wickliffe, perhaps, owes to the earthquake that his body was not consigned to the tender mercies of the secular power, to be consumed in the flames at Smithfield, like those of the many martyrs and confessors who, some centuries afterwards, sealed their testimony with their blood for that noble cause of the reformation, by Wickliffe now so auspiciously commenced. His judges passed a hurried sentence upon him; and, amidst much confusion and precipitancy, broke up the court, retiring in dismay and terror to their own particular occupations and places. Wickliffe was dismissed with the peremptory command not to go back to preach at Oxford any more, but to confine himself, for the future, to the limits of his own parish at Lutterworth. Amidst the large circle of bishops, doctors, and students, Wickliffe "raised his noble head, and, turning a look on Archbishop Courtney

which made him shrink away, uttered these simple, earnest words, *the truth is great and will prevail*,”*

I need hardly say how prophetic these words seem to have been, in that Wickliffe, through the sentence pronounced against him, was allowed leisure, in the retirement of his country parish, to finish the translation of the Scriptures—a blessed work, which, followed up by his many successors in after times, has enabled the truth as it is in Jesus, so to prevail through the mighty empire of Great Britain, as to enlighten, comfort, and build up the souls of the many believers, which are, perhaps, more numerous congregated within her territory than within that of the rest of Christendom besides.

Just so, expecting a large opposition from the Arminian party in the Church from my bold averring of sentiments so diametrically at variance with those congenial to the above system, I adopt the words of the great Wickliffe as my motto, and, therefore, say and pray, “Let the truth prevail”—that is, if the opinions held by the former party be found consonant to the truth, upon a plain and fair verdict, obtained by reference to the Word of God alone—the sole arbiter in such matters—then, by all means, let the Arminian system be so universally upheld, as to be allowed its free course, and be glorified in the land; but if, on the other hand, the views which I have here boldly and prominently set forth be discovered, upon a full and righteous appeal to the above holy standard, conformable to the divine testimony, then I call upon all lovers of truth in my country to stand by me, and to maintain, with their consistent advocacy, the great subject set forth in the present volume. I acknowledge the great difficulty which numbers will have to conflict

* The Book and its Story, pp. 124-129

with, by their being called upon thereby to confess themselves to have been so long in error, by having supported a doctrine so generally avouched as the very seal of all that was right and sound in their Church, creed, and party, as the great "*doctrina stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*." There are none amongst us who wish to be called upon to undo a texture which we have been all our lifetime weaving, and commence another, altogether new. But to such I would answer, if the question concerned a truth of an inferior, or even one of secondary importance, I might allow them to indulge in such natural distaste and aversion—something of necessary pride might seem to be permitted in such a case; but the subject I here contend for being one of first-rate importance—being of the most essential and primary character—being, as we say, a matter for life or death—then promptitude, decision, boldness, and firmness are peremptorily demanded; no parleying or compromise can be allowed; no vacillation or halting between these two opinions; no man can serve these two masters at once; the Church of Christ in this land is called upon to make up her decision. If I be wrong in the statements and arguments by which I have endeavoured to sustain the weighty apothegms which I have here set forth, let me be put down at once; I ask for no personal delicacy to be shown towards me; I demand no quarter; I give no quarter myself. I plainly and boldly say that there is a plague-spot on the national Church; that such plague-spot is **Armi-*

* I use the term Arminianism here, and throughout this work, in the popular sense of the word—viz., as synonymous with the terms—"legalism, Pharisaism, and self-righteousness." The same observation must apply to the word "heresy," and any other technical terms used in this work; which are to be taken according to their popular meaning, and not according to any hypercritical sense.

nianism; that the virus of the disease came in through the Lutheran* *fide sola* heresy; that it is to be found concentrated in the latter clause of the eleventh Article, and is more fully developed and expanded in the homily on "salvation." ("Justification," see Article.) I have, moreover, fearlessly and unhesitatingly declared, that unless this plague-spot be stayed by some timely and judicious interference, and the proper application of some effectual remedy, the gangrene will spread further and further, until it covers the whole body; that it appears to be making rapid strides towards performing this its fatal office in the sister kingdom, through the open and undisguised attacks from Tractarianism, and the more subtle, but not less deadly, assaults from the high-church party, by their industriously preaching up the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; that already the mysterious "handwriting" has begun to be engraven on the walls of her temples, and that unless an united, vigorous outcry be raised on the part of the evangelical brethren within the Church to the God of heaven to stay his decree, it will be soon too late to cry for mercy, when it is the time of judgment. Yes; the testimony of Christ seems ready to meet its consummation in the history of the outward Church. Truly it would appear to be already "the house divided against itself;" and, therefore, to be bearing upon it the marks of its own utter subversion and destruction.

Such are among the grave and weighty charges that I

* I only attack the *system*; I venerate the man. I would not willingly, even if I could, pluck a single laurel from his time-honoured head.

"Neque ego illi detrahere ausim,
Hærentem capiti cum multa laude coronam."

* * Burnet goes far to accuse Luther of semi-Pelagian opinions—Article 17, pp. 210, 211, Oxford ed., 1805. See note 2, and pp. 237-240.

bring against the Establishment. It is in the spirit of friendly warning and admonition that I bring them. I make them in order that a timely and efficacious remedy may be adopted. If I should give pain to some, by thus having deeply probed and laid bare the sore, it is not for any pleasure I can take in causing, abstractedly, sorrow or grief; but rather that, like the judicious and merciful surgeon, who so treats his patient, in order that thus reaching the root of the disease, he may then at once apply the proper palliative and cure. I may say, in the language of St. Paul—"Am I become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"

But, and if I be found a false accuser in bringing such charges, I do not refuse to be at once impleaded; all I ask is for a fair and open trial, and that the evidences, if such can be brought to bear against me, be found only in the words of eternal truth.

But if, on the other hand, the doctrine be found true, according to the unerring standard of God, then, no matter what opposition be raised—how high and influential it may seem to be, I fall back upon my text and say—"the truth is great and will prevail."

I have always thought the advice of Gamaliel most wise, when he said—"Refrain—for if this counsel, or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."

To the God of truth, the author now commits his work, praying that He may bestow upon it such a measure of his patronage as he may think most conducive to his own glory, by the conversion of many souls.

Kilconnell Glebe,
Feb. 1886.

R. F. C.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Bible, as the term means, is the book—the book of books ; it is the most wondrously intellectual production in the world. The Bible is a book completely *sui generis*. The Bible, or rather Christ in the Bible, is in the moral world, what the sun is in the natural world ; from it all spiritual life, and health, and light, and heat come to the soul of the believer. Without the Bible, the world would resemble but a large moral grave and sepulchre, one huge charnel-house of morbid corruption. Without the Bible, the world would resemble the hospital of incurables. Without the Bible the world would resemble the large gaol of condemned felons, hopelessly moving about the dank walls of their prison, surrounded with the clanking irons of their servitude and their crime. Without the Bible—but as it is not my intention to write a treatise on the beauties and perfections of the Bible, I shall now content myself with adverting to merely two or three of the more salient points, such as shall bear more particularly upon the subject-matter, which I have undertaken in the present volume to discuss.

I.—The first point that I shall notice is, that the Bible contains the only revelation of the divine will to man. The Bible is that book which, according to the celebrated, well-known aphorism of Locke, “has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter ;” or, to use the emphatic declaration of Paul—“ All Scripture is given

B

by inspiration of God, (*i.e. theophneustia*, divinely breathed into,) and is profitable for correction, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness," &c. I confess that I feel inclined to adopt that system which believes in the literal or *verbal** inspiration of the Scriptures, for I cannot understand how otherwise any limit can be put to the endless divisions and distinctions, such as, *e. g.*, inspiration of elevation, of supervision, of direction, of suggestion, and other multiplied forms of inspiration too numerous here so much as to mention. How is the boundary line between inspiration and non-inspiration to be drawn? and where is the tribunal to be set up, at the bar of which such knotty questions can, or ought to be decided? But, independently of all such considerations, the literal or verbal interpretation seems ever to make the Word of God to come with such freshness of power before my mind, as to prevent its very language ever satiating or palling upon the taste. Other books, after repeated perusals, become comparatively dull and unattractive; but the Scriptures never do so to him, who reads them according to their proper intimacy and spirit; for the more they are thus understood, and inwardly digested, the more we must delight ourselves with the frequent repetitions and experience of their most gracious and hallowed truths.

"The Bible, in this respect has no equal; it offers to man of every age, place, and condition, surpassing and unfailing attractions, which ever satisfy, and never satiate. In contrast with human production, it interests and develops its momentous import in proportion as it is assiduously read. The more it is examined and re-examined, the more its greatness and sublimity unfold themselves, as if fresh leaves were daily added by some invisible and gracious hand! And hence it is, that both cultivated and simple minds, which have long fed upon the Word, continue to hang upon it, as did

* Note A.

others upon the lips of Jesus. They find its whole contents incomparable; at one time mighty, as the sound of many waters; at another, sweet and gentle, as the voice of a wife to her husband; but always 'perfect, converting the soul,' and 'making wise the simple.'**

To quote the illustration of the celebrated Mr. Boyle, the Scriptures may be compared to that peculiar aromatic eastern fruit "whose kernel is not only nutmeg, but whose involving coat is mace." There is an aroma and a fragrancy—a power and a charm, not only in the substance, but in the very language, or the outward coating of this most blessed of all books.

II.—Again, another point that makes the Bible the most unique and peculiar of all books is the number of its authors—the multiplicity of its separated tracts—the variety of styles in its several compositions, and the lengthened interval which had elapsed before the whole was completed. If any of my readers will run down the page containing the contents of the Old and New Testaments, he will find the number of its authors to be forty—the number of its tracts to be sixty-six; and, as to the variety of style, there will be found in the Bible, examples of the typical, the narrative, the didactic, the historical, the biographical, the prophetic, the proverbial, the allegorical, the highly figurative and poetical, the epistolary, and, in short, almost all kinds of writing. This point becomes explained by the Holy Ghost having condescended to make use of the varied tastes and circumstances of its many authors, who shall be found to graduate from the kingly composer to the humble herdsman of Tekoa; and lower still to the illiterate fishermen of Galilee. A double benefit has thus accrued:—First, through the multiplied phases, the diversified geniuses and characters of the several

* See Professor Gaussen on the Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures, pp. 54, 55.

writers, and each under the special guidance and influence of heaven; the Bible, has become the great depository of all spiritual information—the encyclopedia, as we may call it, of all divine and moral knowledge; and, secondly, the Bible has been thus constructed, that every man, whatever his peculiar taste or genius may be, can find, in this grand treasury of heavenly love and of consummate wisdom, that which may suit the peculiar cast of his own mind and imagination. Thus the Bible has been well compared to one of those huge quarries of nature, where every man may take that which is fitted for his own want, and yet leave an inexhaustible supply for those who may come after him; or, to use the happy illustration of the writer already quoted: “The Bible may be likened to one of those copious, overflowing rivers which the elephant cannot exhaust, and at which the little lamb may slake its thirst.” Lastly, if we consider the interval of time, even 1550 years, which elapsed between Moses, the most ancient of all extant authors, and John, the last inspired penman of revelation, we shall find that this was allowed, among other reasons, for the following two-fold purpose:—First, to prevent the possibility of any collusion, being supposed to take place between the writers, as to the subject matters which they severally delivered, many of them living at the distance of so many centuries from one another, as well as from the peculiarly diversified circumstances and positions in society, being removed from the very utmost boundaries; and, secondly, this interval seemed necessary, in order to fulfil that which we discover from the fact of history, partly to have been the design of Providence—namely, not to give the entire abundance or out-pouring of the revelation of his will to man at once, but only in the way of gradual development, as from age to age, thereby carrying out, after a more perspicuous manner, the analogy that exists between the natural and the spiritual sun, *i. e.*, that as the natural sun sends

not down upon the earth the full confluence of its light all at once, but first there is the comparatively dark-grey dawning of the morning, and after that the risen sun spans, by degrees, the arches of the heavens, until standing over our zenith at noon day, it sheds down the full blaze of its light and glory upon all around ; so, likewise, as respects the spiritual sun of righteousness, it has shone forth, more and more, from age to age, until we, who live under the Christian dispensation, have the benefit of its light, even unto the perfect day.

“ The Bible, in fact, instructs all conditions of men ; it unmask alike the humble and the great ; revealing equally to both the love of God, and unveiling the same miseries. It addresses itself to children ; and it is often children who there show us the way to heaven, and the majesty of the Lord. It addresses itself to shepherds ; and it is often shepherds who are there presented to us to reveal the character of God. It speaks to kings and scribes ; and it is often they who therein teach us the misery of man, humility, confession and prayer. Domestic scenes, compunctions of conscience, secret effusions of prayer, travels, proverbs, out-pourings of heart, the holy walk of a child of God, unveiled weaknesses, falls, restorations, inward experiences, parables, familiar epistles, theological expositions, sacred commentaries on some ancient Scripture, national chronicles, military annals, political developments, descriptions of God, portraits of angels, heavenly visions, practical exhortations, rules of life, solutions of mental difficulties, judgments of the Lord, sacred songs, predictions of the future, accounts anterior to creation, sublime odes, and inimitable poetic imagery ; all these, by turns, present themselves to our view in full and grateful variety, and, as a whole, captivate us like the majesty of a temple. It is thus that the Bible, from its first page to the last, was intended to associate with its sublime unity the undefinable and attractive

features of a human-like, familiar, sympathetic, personal instruction, and of a drama of forty centuries." Such is the spirit-stirring passage from Professor Gaussen, taken from his work on the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, (see page 55,) and which, having met after I had endited the above paragraph, I have thought it right to introduce, as it seems to corroborate that which I had therein written.

III.—A third point that makes the Bible the most unique and peculiar of all books is, that notwithstanding the number of its authors, the multiplicity of its varied tracts, and the lengthened space that intervened between the different writers, yet there is one subject-matter that runs invariably throughout the whole—one more or less directly or indirectly adverted to, either in plain or in symbolical language, by prophetic enunciation, or by biographical example, and that, moreover, without any possibility of previous design or collusion among the writers themselves—and that is, Christ—whose "testimony is said to be the very spirit of prophecy." Yes, Jesus was the key-note that formed the cadence and harmony of the prophet's lyre. "To him gave all the prophets witness;" or, as is stated in still more striking and satisfactory terms by Christ himself, as given in Luke xxiv. 25-27 verses, where Jesus, reproving his disciples, says—"O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory; and then beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." Now, in this passage we note Jesus using the common threefold division into which the Jews were wont to break up the whole of the Scriptures—namely, the law, the prophets, and that which they termed the *Hagrographa*, shows how in all these Scriptures he is testified unto. Indeed Christ forms the golden thread which runs through the whole web of the Divine reve-

lation, and which gives to it at once its beauty and its substantial texture. In fact, it was for this purpose, or to reveal the character of our covenant God in Jesus Christ, that the penmen of Scripture were inspired to compose their several tracts, and not to supply food merely to gratify our curiosity or our intellectual power, whether conveying to us historical information, or prophetic views, or aught of any other kind of knowledge whatsoever. "Under manifold forms we have always the same truth presented to us; always man lost, and God in the character of a saviour; always the first Adam driven from Eden and losing the tree of life, and the second Adam, with his ransomed ones, re-entering Paradise and finding again the tree of life; always the same cry, in ten thousand tones, 'O heart of man return to thy God, for thy God pardons! Ye are in the abyss; escape out of it: a Saviour has descended into it. He giveth holiness and life.' Can it be that a book at once so simple and so sublime is the work of man? was a question put by a celebrated philosopher of the last century to his fellow. To this all its pages have answered, No! for, throughout so many centuries, whichever of the sacred writers held the pen—king or shepherd, scribe or fisherman, priest or publican—everywhere we recognise the same author; and though a thousand years intervene, it is plainly the same Eternal Spirit which has conceived and dictated the whole. Everywhere—at Babylon as at Horeb, at Jerusalem as at Athens, and at Rome as at Patmos—we find the same God described, the same world, the same men, the same angels, the same future, and the same heaven. Everywhere—whether it be a poet or a historian who addresses us, whether in the plains of the desert in the age of Pharaoh, or in the dungeons of the Capitol in the days of the Cæsars—throughout the world, ruin; in man, condemnation and helplessness; in angels, sublimity, innocence, and love; in heaven, purity, happiness, the meeting of truth and goodness,

and the embracings of justice and peace ; the counsels of a God who pardoneth iniquity, transgression, and sin, and who, nevertheless, will not clear the guilty.

“ We therefore conclude that the plentiful traces of humility which are found in the Scriptures, far from compromising their *Theopneustia*, are but indications of their Divinity.”*

To quote the language of an intelligent and interesting modern author, “ The Bible† is a book of *selections*. Innumerable are the transactions which might have been recorded in it instead of those we have ; but here we have a divine selection, and every incident compiled to disclose to us somewhat of our God. The whole of the Scriptures is constructed upon this principle of *divine manifestation*, and more especially as regards that central form of it—‘ God manifested in the flesh.’ ” (compare John xx. 30, 31.) Or, to borrow the words of another celebrated writer:‡ “ How- ever gratifying to our curiosity the perusal of history may be, yet it can never be attended with any solid advantage unless we endeavour to connect the sense of it in an unbroken series, and to trace them as the results of one great pervading cause ; unless we effect this we reduce the study of history into a mere registry of facts, and degrade the historian’s page to the multifarious chronicle of a newspaper ; ” that is, to use the witty remark of a clever legal character, not long since deceased, we reduce history to an *old almanac*.

From the foregoing considerations, as well as others that might be mentioned, we are brought to the conclusion, that “ the Bible, taken as a whole, is a book so little formal and didactic in its composition,” that we should not hope to find in it what might be termed leading or precise definitions of theological terms, and

* Gaussen, pp. 55, 56.

† Lectures on Prophecy, by the Rev. James Kelly, pp. 8, 9.

‡ Theocratic Philosophy, by the Rev. J. D. Schomberg.

much less anything like laboured and consecutively reasoned-out statements or systems of religious truths, but rather must be contented with meeting with some generalized propositions and abrupt and scattered religious sentiments and deductions. There is, however, one great and glorious exception, which God, in his kind mercy to us, has thought fit to bless us with ; and this exception, moreover, is one connected with the most momentous truth which can occupy the mind of any serious inquirer after his own personal salvation. The grand exception which I here allude to is that of the Holy Spirit condescending to make use of the master-mind and genius of him who once sat at the feet of Gamliel, in order to give us his most logically-deduced and lengthened statements of the doctrine of *justification*, and that again in that which forms the chief of all these invaluable epistles, in which the Church of Christ has been enlightened by this most gifted apostolic writer : of course I here allude to the ably-sustained argument of Paul in his elaborate epistle to the Romans.

Taking my stand, then, upon this, the firm ground of the Word of God—making, so to speak, the arch of my argument in this discussion to spring from the solid fulcrum of the divine revelation alone, I cannot appeal from it to the learned dicta, or cruda, or systems of theology of man ; I hold no sympathy with those who would mix up, in anywise, in whole or in part, tradition as an interpreter of the Scriptures. I join not in agreement with that notable maxim of Vincentius, however long and greatly approved of, or however plausible or apparently humble the statement may seem : “ That which was always, everywhere, and by all,” has no charms for me. There never has been a more senseless or a more impossible dogma of the Romish Church set forth, than that which would make her followers look for the sense and meaning of Scripture from that which they style the *universal*

consent of the Fathers. This dogma has been introduced as a canon of interpretation by Rome, in order that she might shut out from the people the reading of the Word of God. She well knows that no such universal consent has ever been discovered, or can be had. Hence, she makes the Scriptures to be a *sealed* book. She well knows that the Scriptures war against her system, and, therefore, she ever wars against the perusal and free circulation of them among the general members of her community. On the other hand we, Protestants, would give the Scriptures the very widest and freest circulation amongst all classes. We hold the right of private judgment to be the great paladium and safeguard of Christianity. With the great Chillingworth, we declare the Bible, and *the Bible alone*, to be the sole religion of Protestants; and if it be objected—where then goes the standard of agreement? and does not such a doctrine hold out encouragement to the very wildest, the most fanciful, and the most discordant interpretations of the Word?—the answer is plain—viz., that I am responsible to God for the right use of my reason, and all other lights and hopes which are afforded to me by Him for coming to a right understanding of the Scriptures; and, moreover, I feel persuaded that, when all such are being used with due humility and faith, under the guidance of the Spirit, so far from endless discrepancy, as much agreement as is to be expected at this side of eternity will be the consequence; and that the fulfilment of the celebrated aphorism of Augustine will be found amongst all thoroughly enlightened and evangelical enquirers after truth—namely, “in essentials, unity; in non-essentials, diversity; in all things, charity;” and, at all events, by the adoption of the above principle, we escape from the boasted unity of Rome, which is but only the unity of ignorance and darkness—of prejudice and superstition, &c. Once more we may ask the question, where are those fathers to be found, from whose writings we are

to get this universal agreement? How few of such fathers are there whose writings have come down to us, and in what points do those, whose writings are amongst us, hold this perfect agreement? Where, again, are the minds so capacious, or the memories so retentive, as to embrace those we have? For, although we admit that the gold of divine truth is here and there to be discovered by delving down into their large and voluminous folios, yet is there so much of superincumbent dross to be cleared away, that however we may admire the patience of such investigators, we cannot approve of their judgment in wasting their time and talents in such undertakings, and, we doubt not, but that many of those, who have laboured hard in such comparatively profitless studies, if they were only to declare their real sentiments, might be found, with the learned Grotius, in dolorous accents, crying out—"Oh, how I have spent my life in laboriously doing nothing."* Such persons seem to me to resemble those adventurers who, leaving their quiet and more obscure, but still their plainer and more palpable duties at home, go with eager and bolder enterprise to seek for gold in a foreign and distant land, where a few, having made sudden and large fortunes, tempt, thereby, the larger mass to lose their time and labour, if not their constitutions and lives, in the forlorn hope of a vain and fruitless speculation. The rare prizes in this lottery are notoriously and ostentatiously blazoned abroad, whilst the many, many blanks are sedulously and industriously kept out of sight. As the favourers of antiquity among the Jews made void the law of God by going after the traditions of Jewish Fathers, so it is to be feared that those who fondly cling to antiquity in the present dispensation, will prove themselves guilty of the same vanity by going after the traditions of the Christian Fathers. We Protestants, make a great and direct difference

* "*Proh vitam perdididi, nihil operose ageudo.*"

between *unity* and *uniformity*. The God we worship is a God of unity, but He is, at the same time, a God of endless diversity. Thus, for example, we find God to be a God of unity, as to wisdom, counsel, and design; but then we find, in the works of nature, so profusely spread around, traces on every side of the most multiplied variety; or, to confine ourselves to man alone, there is that unity of species of mankind, which distinguishes us from all other animals in creation, yet there is no uniformity here, but all going out after the most unimaginable variety of features, general expression of countenance, of limb, of form, &c., &c., so that no two human beings can be discovered in every way alike; and thus with the human mind as with the human body: so that any boasted unity in such respects must be the unity of death and the grave, however we apply the language, whether it be in a natural, a moral, or a spiritual sense; for, according to the analogies of nature, wherever there is life there can be no uniformity. But, after all, there is not in Rome that perfect, monotonous unity, which she would make the world think that she possesses; there is far more discord, disunion, and division, and that, moreover, of the very worst and most rancorous kind, than what meets the eye. Where go, for instance, the animosities, heart-burnings, and jealousies, that have existed from time to time between Franciscans, Dominicans, Passionists, Redemptorists, not to talk of her cis-montanists, and her ultra-montanists. I shall conclude my remarks here by giving a lively illustration of the difference, as existing between Romanism and Protestantism, expressed by Dr. Cumming: "The difference between Romanism and Protestantism, (writes Dr. Cumming,) supposing them both to be nearly right, is this—you, in the Church of Rome, have *unison*, we have *harmony*. You know what is the difference. In unison it is the one note sounded by every body, A minor, or B flat, or C three sharps, or whatever it may be, it is the same

note. The Pope strikes the key-note, say B flat, and then every priest throughout Christendom takes up the same sound. It is not so with us. Our key-note is sounded from the skies, and is taken up on earth; the Church of England, the grand bass; the Church of Scotland, the rich tenor; the Methodists, the wild contralto or alto; the Independents, the brilliant soprano; each in his own part, but all combined, constituting the harmony that is heard among the choirs of heaven.”*

After having thus cleared the way by the above introductory remarks, I feel myself now free to enter at once upon the consideration of the subject which I have now taken in hands more particularly to discuss; and I would make a prayer previously, both for the readers and the writer—namely, that the Spirit of God might come down and allay any angry feeling, or prejudice, or any preconceived notions, from whatsoever cause, which might arise to produce agitation or controversy in their minds, so that we may come dispassionately to investigate what may be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in this, the most solemn and momentous inquiry that can be brought up before the soul of any man even—“How can we that are sinners become just before God.” I know that an argumentum “*ad verecundiam*” will be brought against me for my having attempted to resist such a multitude of weighty authorities by my here suggesting a new phase or view of the great fundamental doctrine of justification. But whilst I say, in vindication of myself, that I am ready to defer, on all proper occasions, to such, and that no person can have more complete and towering respect for the great names and worthies whom I have here, nevertheless, felt myself obliged to oppose—names venerated alike for their learning, for their zeal, and entire Christian devotedness—yet, to use the language

* Romanism as it Is, by Dr. Cumming, p. 15.

of Bishop O'Brien,* "I should be sorry to give any countenance to the supposition that I desired to make this discussion a warfare of great names. To the Bible, in a question of Scriptural truth, . . . I desire to confine myself." And this I do on the two following grounds:—First, that, quoting from the same respected writer, if he, the bishop, could in any respect be supposed truly in humility to state that he was "*in antiquitate plane hospes*,"† I must affirm of myself that I am still more unlearned and inexpert in antiquity; and, secondly, that respecting a doctrine, of which we can know nothing, save as it may be given to us from above, by the teaching of the Spirit through the written Word, to this standard only I feel desirous to appeal—"To the law and to the testimony"—and, therefore, to any statement of truth which I can immediately derive from the Scriptures I feel bound at once to submit, even against whatever weight of accumulated authority which may be brought against me. My motto here must be—"Nullius addictus in verba jurare magistri," which, being translated into the language of Christianity, means, adopting the command of Christ, that "I am to call no man master." I can firmly declare that in the pursuit of the argument which I now submit to the public, I have been, as much as possible, the "man of the one book." If, then, what I have submitted for consideration be found conformable to Divine truth, however unpalatable to the taste of the natural man it may be, I call upon my readers to submit to it, not only without prevarication and reserve, but with all honest candour and approbation—"I speak unto wise men, judge ye what I say."

* Serm. v., p. 136.

† Pref., p. xiii.

SECTION I.

JUSTIFICATION BY GRACE.

THERE is nothing that an inquirer after Divine truth should aim at more, than at clear and well-digested statements of doctrine; inasmuch as unsoundness of judgment in such, leads invariably to unsoundness of practice, and to unsoundness of Christian motive, and of Christian experience. As a general rule, the Holy Ghost works through the enlightening of the understanding, to the sanctification of the heart; or, in other words, he conducts from right principles to right conduct; but of all the doctrines of Holy Writ, there is not one we should be so anxious to have well-defined and lucid explanations of, as that of the doctrine of justification, standing, as it doth, at the foundation of the whole Christian system and structure.

In order to effect this most desirable object, I now propose to treat of this doctrine after the following threefold division—viz., to trace it to its origin, its application, and its results. There are three justifications spoken of in the Gospel—namely, justification by *grace*, justification by *faith*, and justification by *works*; not, however, that by such language I would imply that there are three detached and independent justifications, but rather one whole and completed justification, though manifested after a threefold character and aspect—that is, a begun, a continued, and an ended justification. First, we have the originating fountain of justification; secondly, that fountain opened and

applied; and, thirdly, that fountain running over in living streams of practical holiness and godliness. I wish now for perspicuity sake to explain the plan or arrangement which I propose to lay down for myself in this my first section.

I.—I shall give a plain statement of the doctrine herein proposed to be discussed—namely, “The vicarious justification in Christ of believers.”

II.—I shall state the Scriptural arguments by which the above doctrine is proved, and more especially as such shall bear upon the strong parallelism, in the way of contrast, as substituted between Adam and Christ.

III.—I shall state some of the benefits to be derived to believers by their entertainment and spiritual application of this doctrine. And

IV.—I shall answer some leading objections, such as may be supposed to be brought against the system as here advocated by me.

There are three separate tribunals, at the bar of each of which we must seek for justification; and according to the particular court in which we take our trial, doth the doctrine assume a new feature and appearance; just as there may be three phases on the one shield, or, as when we shift our position in some rich and varied scenery, we take in a new combination of prospect, which, after all, is but the same, though multiplied, landscape of nature.

The first tribunal at which we are to seek for justification is the tribunal of God’s holiness and justice. As we seek to be justified in this court, neither faith, nor works, nor anything else of man’s possession and performance will be received as testimonies in our favour; if they could be brought forward they would be received as most untrue and imperfect evidences in the cause. The believer’s faith—let that faith be ever so perfect—could not stand the test of the scrutiny of God’s justice and essential holiness, no more than any act of his general moral obedience or legal observance.

The merits of the Lord Jesus Christ have been alone pleaded for us at this bar; his righteousness alone has vindicated and acquitted us here; nought of human act or principle must be so much as once named. In fact, we stand not personally in this court at all; to use a technical law term, we have pleaded here, as believers, by *proxy*; another has appeared in our name, has taken up our cause, and made our defence for us; even He, who from everlasting was the great advocate with the Father for his Church, Jesus Christ, the righteous. In the eternal councils he undertook in due time to do that work—assuming that nature which had sinned—by which he would become the *law-fulfiller* and the *sin-bearer* of his elect people. The doctrine of vicarious substitution comes in here to our rescue. We had nothing whatsoever to do towards obtaining this, our justification before God. We could not have had aught to do here, for this justification was effected for us ere we were born. When the Church was thus originally, or from eternity, elected to be justified, it was hid in Christ, or so bound up in oneness with him, that he became its great spiritual representative before the Father, so that whatever Christ undertook, in the fulness of time, to accomplish—and in this respect he was ever looked upon “as the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world”—he was looked upon, not so much as accomplishing it in his own private capacity or personally, but rather altogether officially. It was thus that when Christ, after having fulfilled all righteousness, was crucified, died, and rose again; he did all these acts in a *vicarious* sense—that is, he did them as a public person for his Church, or his believing people in all future ages. When Christ did that which satisfied the divine justice, he became the Church’s satisfier before God, so that when he was justified, the whole Church was regarded as justified in him. Again: in this act, Christ was *alone*—neither the Church collectively, nor any person individually had any act or

C

part here; there was to be no human appearance or performance in this justification at all. Christ was the only surety here; man was no party in this transaction. We were covenanted for in and by him, who was our federal head or moral representative. This is essentially and originally the grand covenant of grace. As far as man was personally concerned, there was no mediator in this covenant—there was no second party present—there was hence no days-man or go-between necessary. In the legal covenant there was—for the law was “ordained in the hands of a mediator”—viz., Moses, who mediated for the people of Israel, as the one party, God himself, or the angels appointed as his deputies on the occasion, being the second party; but in this, the great covenant of grace, as the Apostle Paul argues in Gal. iii. 20, “God is one”—that is, Jehovah was by himself. This covenant was ordained in the hands of the Godhead alone. The three great Hypostases—the mysterious Trinity in unity—completed this covenant among themselves. This great council of peace—this original dispensation of mercy—this primary or anticipatory justification of the elect Church—was effected before man had as yet any existence, or even the world was made. Believers are said to have been “chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.” Neither let those texts in which Christ is represented as the mediator under the new covenant be brought up as opposing the above view of the doctrine; forasmuch as upon due examination it will be found that Christ is never spoken of as mediator in the New Testament, separate from his work of redemption—viz., as the ransom of his people. (compare, for instance, 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; Heb. viii. 6 with Heb. ix. 15, and xii. 24, &c.) Now, this point or peculiar circumstance in the mediatorial undertaking of Christ distinguishes it, first from all usual mediatorial undertakings whatsoever, whether those be such as are commonly being transacted amongst men, or that under the legal covenant as that adverted

to above, wherein no ransom price by blood, and more especially that precious blood by which the covenant of grace was ratified, is ever supposed as necessarily to intervene, or could by possibility intervene. But Christ paid this ransom *alone*; for, to use the language of the Prophet, Isaiah lix. 16, "When he looked, and there was no man, and he wondered, and there was no intercessor, his own arm brought salvation unto him, and his own righteousness it sustained him." This mediatorial work harmonizes with the interpretations given above of Gal. iii. 20; and, secondly, the point now suggested distinguishes it from the system of those false, co-ordinate mediations and intercessions of saints and angels set up by the Church of Rome in opposition to, and contradistinction of, the one alone mediatorship of Christ, inasmuch as no ransom price is supposed to be bound up with such pretended mediations and intercessions.

II.—I have now to enter into a more detailed argument in proof of the great doctrine which I have undertaken, in the present work, to demonstrate; and more especially, as such shall bear upon the strong parallelism in the way of contrast, as substituted between Adam and Christ. I propose to derive my support chiefly, if not almost entirely, from the unerring Word of God, and more especially from that part of it, in which the Holy Ghost has condescended to exhibit for us the truth, that I may use two expressions now very common in modern theology, after the very fullest *development*, and without any *reserve* whatsoever; I mean, of course, the justly most celebrated Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

And here, by the way, I would state, that I hold the doctrines of development and reserve, according to their moderate Scriptural limitation; for, first, as to development, we must all admit that the gradual revelation of the Scriptures at once proves these points; but we deprecate that system of development that would describe any *super-addition* of doctrine to

that which is already contained within the Scriptures, though we admit of such a development—and that, moreover, after any assignable degree—as to an expansive interpretation of the truths, whether prophetic, doctrinal, or preceptive, therein already contained; and thus, so far from us who live in the nineteenth century, going back to the tradition, in the Fathers of the earliest centuries of the Church, in order to glean therefrom purer and clearer expositions of divine truth; on the other hand, we should have the advantage for such (according to the system of development now propounded) from the increasing light derived to us from each additional century; and, secondly, as to the doctrine of reserve, it must be acknowledged that there were many leading truths of Christianity which were, at least comparatively, so far kept back in the Gospels as not to reach to the full and perfect development of these truths, as carried out to their largest definition and expansion in the Epistles, and that, for the wise and weighty reason, because that such had not yet received their fulfilment in the finished work of redemption in Christ. Such for instance, is the doctrine of the atonement, of resurrection life, or of that which we have here now more immediately before us,—viz., the great theme of the Church's vicarious justification in Christ; of one and all which doctrines, as also of many other similar ones, it may be said, in the language of the Scriptures themselves—"The Spirit was not yet given, for Jesus was not yet glorified"—that is, the Spirit was not given for the full revelation and explanation of such truths, until Christ, the great fulfiller of them, was glorified on high, or, according to the express promise of the Saviour to His disciples, that "He would send to them the Spirit of truth, that should guide them into *all* truth." And here, before I pass on, I think it right to record a remark made by Dr. Milner, in his celebrated work on the Church of Christ, which will go to corroborate

the statement I have now made—namely, where he declares that, for any deep examiner into the writings of the first century, there must be exhibited before his mind the very most striking contrast between those written by the apostles and their immediate successors; and this has been allowed, as he most reasonably conjectures, by God, in order that the line of demarcation, which was to separate between that which was inspired and that which was uninspired, might be drawn with the most wiry and broadest edge possible.

But to return. The doctrine of the vicarious justification in Christ of believers depends, very mainly for its proof, upon the corresponding doctrine of our vicarious fall in Adam, as the apostle institutes the most striking parallelism or contrast between these two subjects in the latter part of the 5th chapter of the Romans. As is the nature of the fall, so is the nature of the restoration; as is the disease, so is the remedy. Both these doctrines will be found in the passages alluded to above, to go forward, as we say, *pari passu*, or to be sustained by a similar course of argumentation, so that as we prove the one to be true, we prove the other to be true likewise; they follow in the wake of one another. We come, then, first to the proof of the doctrine of our vicarious fall in Adam.

I.—The vicarious character of the fall of mankind in Adam is founded on the doctrine of original sin. The statement given of this doctrine by our Reformers in the ninth article of our Church is as follows:—"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelegians do vainly talk,) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born in this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." Now, our reformers have not, in this article,

come up to the full definition of the doctrine of original sin, as the Apostle would trace it in the passage above referred to, but have contented themselves in giving one of its leading consequences. This they have done consistently with their adoption of the Lutheran view of justification by faith *only*, as given by them in their eleventh Article. Our reformers have erred on both these points, as we shall see by and by, when these subjects shall be treated of at large in the second section of this work. With regard to the doctrine of original sin, our reformers having lowered the standard of the fall of mankind in Adam, have lowered proportionally the standard of the elevation of believers in Christ; having given no article concerning the vicarious nature of the fall in Adam, they have failed to give an article of the vicarious nature of the recovery in Christ. Between these two doctrines there always exists the very closest, we might say, a kind of Siamese conjunction; so that they may be said to live or fall together; or the barometer of the one is in the inverse ratio of the barometer of the other; that is, so to speak, as the mercury becomes depressed in the one case, it becomes proportionally elevated in the other. Unless therefore we begin by entering into a due and full detail of the character of the one, we cannot enter into a due and full detail of the character of the other; unless we are Scripturally clear and lucid in the laying down of our statement of the condemnation of mankind in Adam; we cannot be Scripturally clear and lucid in the laying down of our statement of the justification of believers in Christ.

Let us now direct our attention to the nature of the fall in Adam. When the Almighty was about to reorganize* the world, so as to render it fit for the habitation of man, it pleased Him not to people the earth all at once with millions of inhabitants, but to

* Note B.

create only *one* man, even Adam; this He did in order to make Adam the radix or root from whence the whole family of mankind was to derive its origin. This was done for the two following purposes, as we may well conjecture:—First, in order to hide pride from man, or to leave mankind without excuse for going out after those great aristocratic, national, or personal distinctions, by which one nation or people may endeavour, from time to time, to lord it with tyrannical sway over another nation or people; or any individual person might think fit, by reason of a little privileged allowance of rank, birth, riches, &c., to try to hold thereby his fellow-mortals under servile bondage, or to exercise any despotism whatsoever over them. All which evils, and others of like kind, we find vain man exercising, notwithstanding the otherwise gracious intention of heaven, with all the presumptuous display of brief arrogance and authority over those who, by reason of their comparative poverty, want of education, and other incidental lowering circumstances, they imagine to be inferior to them; whereas, if the case were properly understood, or thought over, man would see that the whole human family, being descended from one great parent, or unit, all other circumstances would be then considered as comparatively adventitious and accidental; and thus man would deal more equitably and humbly with his fellow-man, and so, if not a greater equality, at least a lesser superiority, and a lesser subserviency would be mutually exacted and exhibited,

But, secondly, God made of “*one** blood all nations of men,” in order that he might lay thereby the foundation of the whole domestic constitution; and thus that men, looking at themselves, as originally derived from one parent common stock, might thereby consider themselves as members of one common family, and thus live as all such, according to the ties of nature,

* Note C.

should live—namely, as bound together in all amity and harmony—"being affectionately allied together in all brotherly kindness and love." How far mankind have answered to those, the beneficent intentions of the Creator, let not only the innumerable private feuds, and strifes, and animosities, but still more, those fearful, bloody, internecine revolutions and rebellions, and, lastly, those terribly exterminating wars carried on amongst mankind from age to age, and from year to year, &c., answer the question. As respects this latter circumstance, I remember reading a calculation made, in round numbers, in which the writer endeavoured to show, that however terrific, beyond all imagination, the destruction of mankind by the waters of the Noachal deluge must have been, yet, by the sword of war there have been *seventy* such deluges, or exterminations of the whole human race executed; and still we do not find mankind, by these judgments, yet learning righteousness by loving one another, and by putting up the sword abidingly into the scabbard, but, on the other hand, do we find the most horrid ingenuity put forth, and the greatest talents exercised, and praised for discovering the very readiest and most deadly weapons, and the varied instruments of warfare, by which whole multitudes of the human family may be put "*hors de combat*," at once; yea, and it has been moreover prophesied by Him, who came as the Prince of peace on earth, that so far from men abstaining from these bloodstained hatreds, that in the last days of the present dispensation, there shall be the wars and rumours of wars, as though these shall be so desolating, as well as so universal, as to set at nought the annals of all former times respecting such. Whether those wars, now being carried on in the East, may be the beginning of the woes, the commencement of the end, or the last crisis, let history, as the interpreter of prophecy decide. We care not to dogmatise, as others have done, in these the deep counsels of heaven, those

vast mysteries of the divine intent that loom in the distant future. We would only state, before concluding the present paragraph, that man has been found more cruel to his own species than the most savage tenants of the forest have been found one to another ; for we never discover lions and tigers, however cruel they may prove to be to other animals, thus systematically warring with lions and tigers, as man wars with his fellow-man. Well, then, may we apply the language of the article, as quoted above, and say that, "man is very far gone (*quam longissime*) from original righteousness," &c.

But it pleased God not only to constitute Adam the natural root from whom the whole human family was to spring, but, secondly, he constituted him moreover to be their moral vicar or spiritual representative ; or, to use the still plainer and more familiar language of technical theology, to constitute him the *federal head* of the species ; in other words, it pleased the Almighty to select Adam to be the specimen which he took and put to the proof, by which specimen he intended to test or try all mankind. It was on this account, among other reasons, as we may conjecture, that such deliberation and pains were put forth by the Divine mind in Adam's creation, when in Gen. i. 26 we read the mysterious language—"Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Again: it was on this account that when Adam was made after so perfect a model, he was placed in the magnificent Eden—the wondrous garden of the Lord—that he was left therein with the most uncontrollable liberty of enjoyment. Again: that as man was created by God with social faculties, and therefore it was not good for him to be alone, the beauteous Eve, miraculously formed from part of himself, was given to him to be his blessed help-meet and companion—the designed sharer of all his joys, his chief solace and delight. In this, the happy paradise of God, they had the fruit of every tree that was pleasant to the

taste and good for food to partake of, with *one* solitary exception, but with the most fearful penalty, should Adam disobey the Divine command. We all know, but too dolefully, in our sad experience, what was the result in Adam's case with regard to this one Divine behest. Adam fell; and by reason of his being constituted our federal head, we are looked upon by God as having fallen in him, with as much of the freshness of the curse of disobedience upon us as though we ourselves had personally put forth the hand, and plucked and eaten of the forbidden fruit. Such is the reasoning of the Spirit of God, speaking through the mouth of the inspired apostle in the whole of the latter paragraph of the 5th chapter of the Romans, and more especially at 12-14 verses, where he says, "Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men in whom" (see marg. read.)—that is, in Adam—"all have sinned; for until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless sin reigned from Adam to Moses, over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who was the likeness or *type* of him that was to come," &c. Here, then, in this most remarkable passage of Holy Writ, we have the doctrine of our vicarious fall in Adam most clearly and logically deduced. The argument in this passage is as follows:—God having declared death to be the penalty for the transgression of his primeval commands to Adam, but some of mankind suffer death either in infancy, or before the age of human accountability, and that sometimes, moreover, under the most aggravated sufferings—*e.g.*, by convulsions or other excruciating pains and torture—but God is too just a Being to allow a punishment to come upon any one without a cause, and more especially such a penalty as death. Sin must therefore lie at their door. What sin? not their own personal transgression, for they are incapable of such; not their fathers', which the reasoning of God with his

people Israel forbid us to imagine, as given in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel.* Whose then, but Adam's, in whom all have sinned, and therefore in whom, as the apostle argues, all die. (see 1 Cor. xv. 22.) Here, then, we have an uncontrovertible argument for the federal headship of Adam. This is the great Scriptural demonstration, by which the vicarious fall of mankind is shown up beyond all power of denial and of refutation.

But the argument becomes still more corroborated, if such were necessary, by the case of true believers in the present dispensation, inasmuch as we find the primeval curse lying in its fullest extent against them. The argument here runs as follows:—Believers standing perfectly justified in Christ have, consequently, *all* their sins forgiven them. The Scripture declarations on this point are somewhat as follow:—They are said to have *all* their sins “cast behind the *back* of God,” or “cast into the *depths* (not the shadows) of the sea,” where they can never be found. God is said not only to forgive their sins, but also to *forget* them. He has laid upon Christ all the sins of *all* his people. He is their spiritual scape-goat, who has carried their sins into the wilderness of forgetfulness, so as never to have them remembered any more against them—“who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree.” Christ is the complete *sin-bearer* of his people, and that so entirely, that not, as the saying is, the “*minima particula*”—not even the *infinitesimal* part of the very *least* sin—lies against them. The cream of the promise consists in the *universality* of it; even that, “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all* sin,” so that there is now no condemnation or judgment of any kind said to be against them that are thus in Christ; for there can be no sin imputed to them, inasmuch as Christ, their spiritual scape-goat, has taken them all away; and yet we find judgments

* Note D.

of various kinds, and condemnations of all sorts, as far as the present life is concerned, brought to bear upon them, so that each believer in Christ can cry out with Paul, and say that "if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable;" for, first, they have the trials of the *curse* lying against them in their fullest measure of outpouring and for endurance. For what were these, as took place in the case of Adam? There was expulsion from Eden; his being driven out into the wilderness of this wide world of toil and sorrow to till the earth, now no longer bringing forth spontaneously everything that was good for food, &c., for him, but bearing thorns and thistles, &c.; in sorrow eating his bread all the days of his life. Now, all these trials the believer has to bear, like other men. He can give his heartfelt, sorrowing sympathy, like others, to those words of mourning—"Man, that is born of a woman hath but a short time and is full of misery," &c.; and with these and all other like woes of humanity, believers have, moreover, the trials of the *cross* to endure, even those which come upon them, by reason of their peculiar profession of faith, from a scoffing and infidel world; and to sum up all, after all these afflictions in the flesh—for the rule with such is, "it is through many tribulations that they are to enter into the kingdom of heaven"—they are called to taste *death* like other men. Now, why all this? God is too just a Being to inflict a punishment, and especially so many, and so great punishments without a cause. But what cause can there be respecting believers *personally* who have no sin—not the *minima particula*, as we have reasoned above, lying against them. It must, then, be the sin of another, even that of Adam, in whom all have sinned. I cannot see how such arguments can be rebutted; for to say that all the trials of believers are sanctified to them, and thus become blessings in disguise, will not answer the question; forasmuch as such contingencies of their afflictions merely go to

show how our gracious God is able to overrule the evil for good, and how, according to that promise of his mercy, he makes "all things work together for good to them that love him;" (Rom. viii. 28;) but they do not show, by any means, why such divine chastisements—"none of which are said to be joyous, but grievous"—are inflicted where no personal sin can be imputed.

Again: if we come from the natural to the *moral* effects of Adam's solitary act of disobedience, as such bears upon the experience of believers in the present world, we shall find the argument for the doctrine of Adam's federal headship, or of our vicarious fall in him, still more strengthened and confirmed. For this, as regards Adam, appeared in the total, radical, and, as I may say, instantaneous corruption of his nature, proved at once by what is stated in Gen. iii., 7, which shows, as already demonstrated in his case, the "*quam longissime*," and the "*phronema sarkos*" of the article; or, in other words, from being possessed of a perfect purity, so great indeed as that it is impossible for our fallen imagination to conceive, (and in which, in no respect, seems more exhibited before my mind, than by what is stated in Gen. ii. 25,) he had become at once "carnal, sensual, devilish." Again: in Adam's hatred of communion with his God, as we find in Gen. iii. 8; in Adam's thorough selfishness, unmanly and recreant cowardice—viz., by his trying to lift up the blame from his own shoulders, and putting it upon the weaker shoulders of his wife, whom lately, that is, before he sinned, he loved so tenderly. Now the believer, after that he stands accepted in Christ as the beloved, and thereby has obtained a new nature in him, finds, nevertheless, all the motions towards the above sinnings in himself. Now, how is this, or why is this? This evil nature he has not only derived from Adam by reason of covenant natural incorporation in him; but also after he has become regenerated in Christ, it still cleaves to him,

and shall cleave to him even to the end of his existence. But why is this allowed by God, only to give us a continuous proof of the doctrine here laid down—namely, that the original sin, or the one positive act of Adam's transgression, with all its fearful consequences, follows believers to their very grave; or, in other terms, that as* Adam himself never personally got rid of the decree which God's justice set against him for one act of disobedience, so none of his posterity can get rid of the same decree of God's justice, and that because they each and all were looked upon as bound up in federal union, or incorporation with him, not only as their original stock, but as their covenant head, as being the specimen of the natural man selected by God, to be tested, and put to the proof, not for himself only, but for *all* his posterity; and therefore as Adam could never get rid of his one act of disobedience, but all that was said in Gen. ii. 17 lay against him for it, for, though he did not actually die the day he eat the forbidden fruit, but lived many hundred years after, yet, during all that interval—yea, and suppose that interval to have been increased for thousands of years, Adam was considered as *dead in law*—the statute of outlawry was pronounced against him, just as the condemned felon, when once sentence is passed upon him, is thereby considered in law defunct, although it might be, a month, or a year should pass before the sentence of his execution actually should take place.

My argument here would be after the following order:—Sorrow and suffering are the consequences of sin, so that if there was no sin there would be no sorrow or suffering; but believers in Christ have no sin laid against their charge by God, forasmuch as they were found perfectly justified before him by the righteousness of Christ, “in whom they had for-

* Note E.

givenness of sins through his blood." They were pleaded for by proxy or representation; yet believers have their full share, yea, oft-times a fuller share of sorrow and suffering than others. How is this? Surely God is too just a Being to inflict a penalty without a cause. Sin, then, must lie at their door. What sin? Not their own, for God seeth none *personally* in them, they having been "justified from *all* things by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "He has cast *all* their sins behind His back"—"into the depths of the sea," from whence they shall never be brought up against them, for this is the covenant that God makes with his people. He declares that "he will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their unrighteousness he will remember no more." The prerogative, or rather the peculiarity of God's mercy towards his people is, that he not only forgives their sins, but *forgets* them also. Seeing, then, that there is no personal sin, and therefore no judgment against the people of God, what sin can be found against them to produce so dire an amount of sorrow and suffering, but that of another, even of Adam, "in whom all have sinned;" whose *one* solitary act of disobedience stands out with all the freshness of a new performance against every one engendered of him, and which sin, with the evil nature as the consequence of it, he has transmitted as the fearful heir-loom to all his posterity, and which is the cause or motive of all the evil and concupiscence, which still attach themselves to believers. Such, then, is the argument which I propose for the consideration of my readers, and through which we arrive at the full proof and vindication of the doctrine which I have here undertaken to set forth, even that of Adam's having been constituted the federal head, or the moral representative of the whole human species.

I would wish further to illustrate the doctrine above touched upon, by a forcible and striking example, even that of Paul himself. In Romans iv. 6-8, Paul thus

describes the "blessedness of a man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered: blessed is the man unto whom the Lord will not impute sin." Now, mark, we have the three-fold expression, by which the Holy Spirit would represent before us the perfect erasing from the tablet of the Lord's memory of all the sins of those who come under the blessedness above described. Now, if any person ever lived who came under the complete enjoyment of the above benediction, it was Paul himself; and yet, let us turn to 2 Cor. xi. 33, and surely we must say that no person, next to the blessed Saviour, underwent such a climax of sorrow and of suffering as did Paul since his conversion.

Again: if we look to the character of Paul after his conversion, we must say that never did any human being evidence, by a life of complete Christian devotedness and zeal, a fuller testimony of the works of personal sanctification in his heart; nor of any person could it be said that 1 John iii. 16 received a fuller and more complete vindication in his future course to the last moment of his mortal existence, than it did in his case. Now, how can we reconcile the doctrine of perfect and free forgiveness with the multiplied and unheard-of afflictions poured out upon so holy and exemplary a character as Paul, unless we take into consideration the doctrine of the federal headship of Adam? I know that I shall be met, in reply, with such answers and positions as the following:—that I shall be told, for instance, that Paul had the most extraordinary sufferings, but still there was nothing at all of a punitive or judicial character in them; yea, that to him all his trials, however varied and severe, were but blessings in disguise. Does he not himself term them but the disciplines of a father's love? (See Heb. xii. 5-11.) Does he not, setting future glory against present suffering, declare that those afflictions were not worthy to be

compared with those interminable joys and glories, that were looming in what was not for him a very distant future? Does he not talk of "filling up what was behind of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church," that is, that since the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings, so a suffering head must have, in all due consistency, a suffering body and suffering members? Does he not declare, that as the sufferings of Christ abounded in him, so his consolations abounded in Christ? just like one of those rapid mountain torrents which, being fed by perennial Alpine glaciers, never become dry, but which flow deeper and wider in the summer's hottest season, his rays melting down the huge mountain avalanche of snow, &c.; just so the more congealed and frozen Paul's outward man became, by multiplied superincumbent sorrow and afflictions, the more through the beaming rays of the Sun of righteousness coming down upon him, he found his inner man supplied with the under current of a never-failing stream of rich and inexhaustible grace, mercy, and every spiritual blessing. In a word, does he not state it, as his experience, that he was enabled to "glory in tribulations also," not only because of the various graces of the Spirit, which tribulations, when they are sanctified, are ever calculated to produce, but because the more of the cross now, the more of glory by-and-by; the rule being, "if we suffer with Christ, we shall also be glorified together." Now, all these consequences of affliction, and many more considerations too numerous here to mention, received in a Christian spirit, are perfectly true, and yet they touch not, in any respect, the point of the argument here put forth—namely, how God, as a God of justice, can allow any trial to come upon any individual, whose sins He has forgiven. Let us take a plain example, such as may bear upon the case before us. Suppose a sovereign to state, that in his exercise of the prerogative of mercy,

D

he had perfectly forgiven some convicted felon the crime laid to his charge; but that, at the same time, he would send word to such *forgiven* felon, that he should make bare his back, and suffer as many stripes upon it, as could be endured with safety to the preservation of life; yea! and that no sooner was his back healed from the effects of the first flagellation but that he should endure the same for eight times, say in regular succession; yea! and, moreover, that he should be afflicted with bonds and imprisonment, and numbers of other hardships, perils by sea and by land, and at the termination of a life of such toil and suffering, he should undergo the final penalty of the law, and be executed accordingly; but that the sovereign, in making him endure all these things, was doing all for his ultimate good, that he was to consider them merely as the "disciplines of a father's love," &c., &c. We need not stop to argue in what light such a *free* pardon and forgiveness would be received.

How, then, are we to account for the frightful catalogue of his suffering, as enumerated by the apostle in 2 Cor. xi. 23-33—a catalogue that makes the very blood to grow cold in the veins, whilst we only read it; but when we think of it, as being endured by him, who was the most devoted follower of his Saviour that ever lived, and unto whom the Church of Christ holds a deeper debt of gratitude, than to any other individual, for his incomparably spiritual and enlightened writings, we acknowledge the dispensation to be completely mysterious and unaccounted for upon the common and popular grounds of explanation. Unless we take the doctrine of the federal headship in Adam, and bring it to bear here, we shall not be able to solve the difficulty at all; and if I be asked how this doctrine solves it, I answer, it does so by the following reasoning or view of the subject:—First, whilst we admit the redemption in Christ, as respects the free forgiveness of sins, to have been as full and as perfect, as words can express

on all points to which it referred, there was, nevertheless, one particular point to which it did not extend, as far as the present dispensation is concerned, and that is, the removal of Adam's one sin and its judicial consequences from his people, who are bound up with it and all its fearful issues as much as the rest of mankind. But death and all men's woes are said to follow from this one act of disobedience or original sin. It is, therefore, to this great foundation of evil that we are to trace up the fearful catalogue of the apostle's sufferings, as detailed in the passage above quoted, taken from 2 Cor. xi. 23-33. Paul had indulged the lusts of the flesh, the "phronema sarkos," as the ninth Article calls it, in his unconverted state as much, if not more, than any other man. The old Adam in him was of most strong, and turbulent, and violent constitution; he allowed it to go out into the most excessive degrees of violence; he seemed to put no check-rein upon its unbridled power, in one respect at least—namely, his carnal hatred against, and his opposition to, the cause of Christ and his believing people. To give his own words, he had been a "blasphemer, reprobate, and injurious." Like the ferocious lion who, it is said, will take its cub, and making it drink in blood, communicates to it hereby an instinctive desire for it above all other aliment, thus did he who is called the "old Lion going about seeking whom he may devour," take young Paul, his too ready pupil, and first making him taste, so to speak, the blood of the proto-martyr Stephen, teach him to become thus the greatest persecutor of his age, so that he breathed out threatenings against the disciples of the Lord, punishing them oft, as he states of himself, "in every synagogue, and compelling them to blaspheme, being exceedingly mad against them," &c., &c. My argument here is as follows:—namely, that whilst all believers are born under the influence of original sin, yet some are permitted to let its evils go out to a greater degree of excess of riot than are others, and so of Paul;

but original sin, and its consequences, being without the pale of Christ's redemption, comes under the judicial inflictions of God's justice, and, by consequence, such judgments will, according to equity, be proportionable to the indulgences of the "*pronema sarkos*" in each individual; and so Paul having indulged herein excessively, proportionably severe were the visitings of the divine enactment against them. And indeed if Paul himself found it necessary to put himself into the attitude of a pugilistic combatant against the flesh, or the old man of sin within him, so as, according to his own phraseology, to strike him under the eye, in order to keep it under, surely we need not be so much surprised at God making him to undergo the fearful amount of trial already enumerated, with that which also appears to have been the culminating climax of all Paul's sufferings, mysteriously announced to us as "*the thorn in the flesh*," (whatever is meant by such a singular phrase,) and from which the apostle thrice besought the Lord to set him free, but without avail. And, no doubt, when Paul was receiving, at the hands of his persecuting fellow-countrymen, the torture of the dreadful eastern knout upon his blood-streaming back, five times repeated, together with the fearful, thrice-repeated flagellations from the lictor's rods, as well as his other unheard-of perils by sea and by land, &c., &c., no doubt, I say, he would call to remembrance his own persecutions of the members of the infant Church of Christ, and acknowledge the recognition of the equitable measure of punishment dealt out to himself, for all his own most cruel and sanguinary proceedings on such occasions; and thus I would say, that similar will be the reasonings of other Christians, according to the limit of their severally assigned experience. We must all testify to the existence of that within us which deserves to come under the penal denunciations of God's righteous anger, which merits God's wrath and damnation, and that we are punished,

after all, far less than what our iniquities have deserved, —even those iniquities which proceed from the old man within us, and which is “corrupt after the deceitful lusts,” and with which, although we are not bound up with it in the way of personal identity, as to our justification or final salvation, (for, as respects those latter doctrines, there is no sin seen in us whatsoever, but all is forgiven through the free forgiveness in Christ, and, therefore, there is no condemnation or penal judgment coming upon us on such account,) yet we are bound up as to *temporal, judicial* inflictions for them, and so we feel, although acknowledging ourselves to be under the guidance and protection, even the special providence, of Him who has engaged, as our reconciled Father of mercies, to bring good out of evil to his confiding children, and to make them, even these the chastisements of his anger against sin, to be among the all things that “work together for good to them that love him,” &c.

I would now lay down the following propositions, as so many corollaries deduced from the line of reasoning here adopted:—

The first proposition is, that if we take the very holiest man that lives, even he of whom we might say that “that which is born of God” in him had reached unto the full stature and proportion of the perfect man in Christ, so far at least, as human nature, in the present dispensation, is capable of such advancement towards perfection, yet we have found, that such a man has that within him to which the apostle, viewing it as the very concentrated essence of evil, gives the fearful denomination, or rather personification, of SIN. He bears that about with him, which is the outlawed of God—is the impress of Satan—hath the brand and anathema of heaven stamped upon it.

My second proposition is, that though the believer carries this thing called “flesh, in which no good thing dwelleth,” continually about with him, so that we cannot get rid of this body of death, no more than the condemned Roman slave could get rid of the dead carcase, that was

chained to him ; yet, in the judgment of heaven, the believer is not bound up in identity, or in personal responsibility with it ; for, as Paul says, Rom. vii. 17, " It is no more *I* that do it, but *sin* that dwelleth in me."

My third proposition is, that though not identified with this body of sin, but groaning continually for deliverance from it, yet is it the cause of all the punitive and judicial inflictions which the believer suffers at the hand of God, who otherwise, according to the blessedness pronounced, Rom. iv. 6-8, could not suffer, according to the strict rules of justice, aught of pain or sorrow at the hands of his all-forgiving God. Death and all man's woes are to be traced up to this primeval source of all evil ; for otherwise, as soon, at least, as any person repented, and was converted, and believed the Gospel, then should we suppose, according to the strict rules of equity, that the Christian should be released from having anything more to do with earth, and would be translated at once, like Enoch or Elijah, into the realms of glory. For although the afflictions which the Christian undergoes here, by the omnipotent graciousness of heaven, are made to subserve for his ultimate eternal welfare, and that he is called on, therefore, by the apostolic rule, " to count it all joy when he falls into divers temptations, knowing that temptation worketh patience," &c. ; yet still, since if there were no transgression there could be no sorrow, and as there is none to be seen in him, who stands justified before God through the vicarious righteousness of Christ, there should be no sorrow for such ; but, on the other hand, as believers have more sorrow, generally speaking, than falls to the share of the ungodly of the earth, we must trace up the cause of all such to that original sin derived from Adam to all his posterity, and which, therefore, has got the Scriptural appellation of the *old* man in us, and which has been left unredeemed, and, therefore, untouched, by that blood which cleanseth from all other sin besides.

Fourthly, I would remark, that if *one* sin, and that not *our own*, but one which has come by imputation upon us, according to the decree of a just God, brings down such a weight of sorrow and of suffering, how much more dreadful must be the amount of condemnation to come upon those, who have not only such to answer for, but also all their own unrepented, personal transgressions. And, again, what must be the untold mysterious amount of suffering of Him, who had the sins of his whole Church, by imputation, upon him; well might he be called "the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," and well might his "sweat be like great drops of blood coming down to the ground," by reason of their unmitigated superincumbent weight and pressure.

Fifthly, and lastly, I would remark, that whilst death must be looked upon as the penal enactment of the Lord's righteous denunciation for original sin, and to be deprecated so far as the actual pain of dying is concerned, yet, viewing it, as the medium which God has appointed for the destruction of the flesh, we should ever rejoice at its approach, as being then about to be delivered for ever from the burden of the flesh. Thence Paul puts death amongst the inventory of the Christian's blessings, saying, 1 Cor. iii. 22, "All things are yours, whether life or *death*," &c. Indeed, death may be for the believer compared, at least as to its issue, to the large percolator or filtering machine, through which, that which is pure and refined is drawn off, whilst that which is impure and sedimental remains behind: "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption."

But as to discuss this subject fully would be here irrelevant, inasmuch as it would exceed all bounds that we could now assign to it, and as it belongs more to those practical subjects, which I hope to be enabled, in my next volume, to bring before the public mind; I

shall now shut it up by giving six reasons why Christ, whilst he came to accomplish a most perfect and glorious redemption for his people, yet did not think fit to redeem any of them from the original sin of their first parent, or the penal consequences of it.

The first reason that I shall assign for Christ not having undertaken the reformation of the old Adam, as it is called, in us is, that God did not reverse the sentence of the curse denounced against Adam himself, but because of the one act of disobedience continued the statute of outlawry pronounced against him unto the end of his life; but Christ did not appear for the purpose of reversing this the sentence denounced in the judgment of heaven against that which God's justice had already tried, and condemned in our first parent.

Christ sanctifies his elect people, not by "renewing the old man which is corrupt after the deceitful lusts," but by superinducing a new nature upon him over the old one, and therefore our business is to keep the old nature under, and bring it into subjection to the spiritual man within us, and this conflict and struggle is to continue, until death finally destroys this old man of sin and corruption. Hence the necessity of death to the believer, which is put amongst the inventory of his blessings, forasmuch as not until then shall we be completely delivered from the burden of the flesh. Hence the true believer, instead of fearing death, or looking for him as the king of terrors, looks upon him as a kind friend, ready to release him from that dreadful enemy which is always ready to rise up in fresh antagonism against all that is pure and holy, or of good report within him.—(See page 39.)

A second reason why Christ should have nothing to do with the reformation of the old nature within believers is, that it is perfectly irreclaimable; it refuses all discipline and correction whatsoever; "it is the flesh in which dwelleth no good thing;" it is the sin that

dwelleth in the very best and holiest saint on earth, which prevents him doing the thing that he would ; it is that law of utter and hopeless depravity working in our members, that wars against the law of the believer's mind, and brings him into that captivity as to make him, in dolorous accents, to cry out, "Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death."

Like the house in which the leprosy of old found a place, and which became so thoroughly impregnated and infected in every part of it that, by the command of God, the house was commanded to be taken down to its very last stone ; so with this old tabernacle, which hath the plague of this old Adamic sin within it, it must needs be destroyed, and the new building, even the house not made with hands, erected in its room. The awful and disgusting description given by the prophet, in Isa. i. 6, is but the type of this old nature ingrained in the very best, and to remain during this mortal existence:—"The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint, from the sole of the foot even to the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores."

A third reason why Christ refuses to have aught to do in the reformation of the old Adam is, that assigned by Paul, why he strove to preach the Gospel where Christ was never named—namely, that he did not "like to build on another man's foundation." Thus Christ will not build upon any part of the old nature, not only because the whole is untrustworthy, the dry-rot having got, so to speak, into the timbers of the roof, the walls having got from out of the perpendicular, the light and air of heaven breaking through a thousand chinks or chasms in every part, and the whole building having become quite crazy and worn out. Now, notwithstanding all this be perfectly true as regards this old tabernacle of the flesh, yet, we must remember, that Christ's business here was to regenerate,—

to make all things new, to build up a new erection altogether upon the soul of man.

A fourth reason is, that Christ came to confer *eternal* life upon all those, who were the saved in him, but there is nothing in the old Adam, that hath aught of real permanent existence about it. All that we have derived from Adam hath been death, mortality, corruption, &c.; but all we get from Christ, on the contrary, is life, immortality, &c.; and as it would be preposterous, therefore, that an architect, commanded to erect some fine, abiding structure, should immediately collect decayed materials for such purpose; so Christ about to build for eternity, must have, not only the new foundation, but altogether new materials.

A fifth reason to be assigned for the above is, that Christ can in nowise, directly or indirectly, become a minister of sin, and though he has taken the sins of his people upon him by imputation, yet this is different from his coming into such close contact with sin, as to change its very nature and character. In a word, though God is omnipotent, as to all things that are good, excellent, and perfect, &c., yet are there some things, which seem impossible to God, such as, for instance, the apostle states—"God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." Again: God cannot look upon iniquity; and so, as the Spirit has stated in his Word, Christ must be so separate from sinners, as not to come into the above-mentioned contact with sin; for, as Solomon states, "No man can touch pitch without being defiled;" and indeed sin seems so completely alien, so entirely in opposition to the nature of God, that he cannot but away with it; and more especially that primeval sin which, like the first-born of Satan, rendered Adam almost the very incarnation of the evil one, so far, at least, as this originating principle of evil was concerned.

Sixthly, and lastly, if Christ were to come to reform the old Adam in us, what would it be, but to open a

door of hope even to Satan himself, for if Christ could take that which was Satan's impersonation, and regenerate it, why would not then the next step in advance, be to regenerate Satan himself?

Such are some of the hints, rather than lengthened arguments, by which I would sustain my original declaration, that the work of regeneration in the soul of man has nothing to do with a renewal of that old body of corruption, under the influence of which every man engendered of Adam is created; and I have been the longer, and the more varied in carrying out my views on this latter subject, inasmuch as I think it is one, but little preached upon by even the evangelical teachers of the day, and one, therefore, that the Church of Christ requires to be well instructed in, as being a doctrine of the most vital and fundamental importance.

To return to our subject after the above digression. Such, then, stands forth this fundamental doctrine of the federal headship of mankind in Adam—a doctrine that we should not look upon any way as harsh, unreasonable, and unjust in God, forasmuch as that, independently, that we can never attribute such qualities to any of the divine counsels or acts, (however mysterious and insoluble such may sometimes appear,) it is, after all, but the way which we take ourselves, with the various animals, which come within the range of our knowledge or our use. We do not take each animal and test it one by one; but having tried one of each species, we judge of the qualities of the rest according to the specimen which we have selected for examination. And here we would further remark, that since it pleased the Almighty, in his infinite wisdom, to test our species, or to try mankind by one selected individual, he could not have done us more justice, than having put us under trial in Adam, with all the advantages with which he was surrounded; possessed with such a rare combination of unimaginable human perfections—coming fresh from the hands of his Creator—

made after his moral image, and filled with every motive for gratitude, and the other reasons for obedience. And as Adam, with all such graciousness surrounding him, fell, which of his offspring could proudly say, even if the choice were given to him, that he would prefer being put upon trial individually for himself?

But again: is not God's dealing with us through Adam as the attested sample of the species, somewhat analogous with the manner after which we deal with our members of parliament? For we are satisfied to have our laws made through them in the way of delegated representation; that is, we are satisfied to make over our rights to them, and to bind ourselves, by voluntary engagement, by their decision in the acts of legislative council, just as much as though we voted in our own persons.

And again: to give one example still more to the point before us. Let us see how our legislation deals with the cases of conspiracy and rebellion. Let us take that of a nobleman found guilty of the misprision of treason, or of the open deed. The act of attainder by which, as a convicted traitor, he has forfeited his title and his estates, not only applies to himself personally, but the taint of treason comes down through his blood, so that his immediate posterity, however loyal they may be, remain deprived of their rank and inheritance until, by the gracious act of the sovereign, the attainder be reversed.

The argument for the federal headship of Adam would seem to derive further corroboration (if such, indeed, were necessary) from that Scriptural statement that "Adam was not first deceived, but that Eve being deceived was first in the transgression." The reasoning here would be as follows:—God pronounced a curse upon Adam, if he would break the one commandment given to him, even that of not eating the forbidden fruit; but Eve was the first to disobey, yet, do we not find any part of the pronounced curse taking place

upon her having eaten thereof: but upon Adam's transgressing afterwards, we find the curse in all its severity pronounced against him, and all his posterity. Now why was this? but because that Adam was constituted the federal head of the human family; for, as far as the passage of Scripture just quoted would lead us to conjecture, we must come to the conclusion, that though Eve had transgressed the commandment, yet if Adam had not done so, then had not followed the curse or judgment decreed by heaven's justice, as the righteous consequence of disobedience.

Another point, if it doth not go to substantiate, at least we may hope it may throw some lateral or indirect light upon this important doctrine, is derivable from the fact of our Saviour having been born without any taint of original corruption. The reasoning here may be supposed to run somewhat after the following manner:—All mankind, according to the testimony of Scripture, and which testimony is borne out by the statement in the ninth Article of our Church, have derived a radically corrupt nature from Adam; but the Saviour, though he took human nature upon him, had no such taint or infection of original corruption cleaving to him. His human nature, like his divine, was without any spot of sin—"being holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" but how could this be, as he was born of a woman, if the taint of original corruption had descended through *the female* line, which it must have done, was Eve appointed a federal head as well as Adam? Hence we conclude that original sin was transmitted through the *male* line alone to mankind: and therefore we further conclude, that Adam alone was the federal head of the species.

And here I would remark, that we arrive at the very best mode of meeting that monstrous dogma of error which is lately come forth, "ex cathedra," or authoritatively, from Rome; I allude, of course, to that of

the "immaculate conception of the Virgin," which is a point, according to our reasoning above, quite out of place to moot in theology, inasmuch as we have proved the taint of original corruption to have been transmitted through the *male*, and not the *female*, line; and, therefore, as Christ derived his human nature through the latter *alone*, hence no infection or corruption lay upon him at his birth. Neither can the passage in Job xv. 4 be objected against the position here maintained—viz., "What is man that he should be clean, or he that is born of a *woman* that he should be righteous." The answer is obvious—namely, that no person born in the course of *natural* generation of woman can be clean, as every such person must derive the taint of birth-sin or corruption through his natural father; but Christ had no natural father touching his human nature, and, therefore, no such taint lay upon him; or, in other terms, his was the *only* purely immaculate conception; not *Mary's*, nor that of any other person born of woman.

Here I may remark, by the way, how Adam, in the above respect, was a type of Christ; for as Adam had neither natural father nor mother, so Christ, the second Adam, as to his human nature, had no natural father, and, as to his divine nature, had no natural mother. And here again we condemn another fearful error of Rome—viz., that of calling Joseph the father of Christ, and that of calling the Virgin Mary, the mother of God.

Such, then, is the cumulative evidence which can be brought forward in support of this most important doctrine of the vicarious fall of mankind in Adam, and such also is the nature and consequences of the fall in Adam, and which latter I have spread out more largely, or rather have analyzed the more fully, because that, as I have already stated, the more deeply and properly we probe the wound, the more we shall be thereby in a position to reach unto the proper salve and

cure ; or, to give a technical medical term, the more we get at the right diagnosis of the disease, the more capable we become of reaching unto the right diagnosis of the remedy.

And now I shall sum up, in the way of evidence, the various salient points, or peculiar features, that I have above laid down, showing how each point shall strikingly point out the parallelism which, in the way of contrast, exists between Adam and Christ.

1. First, as Adam was constituted the *radix* or originating root from whence all the family of mankind was to spring, so Christ was appointed the *radix* or originating root, from whence all the spiritual family of the elect Church was to spring likewise. As the acorn contains, in diminutive embryo, the future developments of that great giant vegetable production, which, within a century afterwards, may stand forth on the mountain-top, the glory of the forest, just so Adam was ordained the *single* seed from which, during thousands of years afterwards, the great genealogical tree was to spring, with all its numberless out-spreading branches extending through every age, and kingdom, and climate of the habitable earth ; thus was Christ ordained to be the one spiritual seed from whence the redeemed of mankind, even the elect people of God, in every age and clime, were to derive and to trace up thier origin : for, as Adam having been put by God into a deep sleep, had taken from his body her who afterwards became to him, as he said, “ bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh,” and whom he called his beloved Eve, —(that is, as the Hebrew word means, the mother of all the living,) so Christ, having been put into the transient sleep of death, awakened out of it, having thereby created for himself her, that was to be the spiritual Eve, or the spiritual mother of all his spiritual offspring ; as the apostle states, talking of the union which should exist between man and wife, says that they “ twain should be one flesh :” This is a great mystery, but I speak

concerning Christ and his Church." This is the first parallelism, or contrast, between Adam and Christ.

2. But, secondly, Adam was constituted the federal head of mankind; and so Christ was appointed the federal head of the redeemed from out of mankind. As it pleased God to have selected Adam as the specimen by which he intended to test all mankind, so it pleased the Almighty to select Christ as the specimen by which he intended to test the whole saved Church. Adam, indeed, was to be tested only as to *one prohibitory act*, but Christ was tested as to *all* acts of the law, *mandatory* as well as *prohibitory*; yea, and not only so, as to a perfect, universal, *active* obedience to all its precepts, but to its *passive* requirements also. Christ not only fulfilled all righteousness for his people, but also bore the *penalty* of their sins. He stood forth thus in the double capacity for them—viz., that of their *law-fulfiller* and of their *sin-bearer*; and thus as Adam's apostacy was "*one* offence to condemnation," so Christ's righteousness was of "*many* offences unto justification."

A third parallelism, in the way of contrast, between Adam and Christ, consists in the results consequent upon their respective public official positions, as such bear upon the several bodies which they represent, and more especially as to the *mode* and manner of such results. First, after a general manner—in Adam, all sin for those who are represented by him; in Christ, all righteousness for those who are represented by him; in Adam, all condemnation; in Christ, all justification: in Adam, all death; in Christ, all life: in Adam, all misery; in Christ, all happiness: in Adam, all slavery; in Christ, all liberty: in Adam, all curse; in Christ, all blessing: Adam the mount Ebal; Christ the mount Gerisim: in Adam, all hell; in Christ, all heaven: in Adam, all Satan; in Christ, all God.

And then as to the *MODE* of such communication. As respects Adam, it is *not* in the way of *external imputation*, as most divines state, but it was in the way of natural

incorporation, whereby all mankind having been in the councils of heaven, looked upon, as *in his loins*, when he transgressed *the one* solitary injunction, each individual of his posterity is looked upon as having sinned in him with all the freshness of the actual deed, as being personally identified with him. Of which manner of dealing, we have a notable example in Heb. vii. 9, 10, where Levi is said to have paid tithes in his father Abraham, inasmuch as he was looked upon in the councils of God as being in *the loins of Abraham*, (when he, Abraham, met Melchisedec as he was returning after that he had spoiled the kings, and then presented Melchisedec with the tithe of all the spoils,) although Levi was not actually born for 150 years after. And so, believers are looked upon as having obeyed in Christ, with a complete and an universal obedience, active and passive, and that also, *not after the manner of an external imputation* of Christ's righteousness to them by faith, as most persons represent, but after the mode of a spiritual incorporation, whereby the whole Church was regarded as bound so up in Christ, as to be identified with all his public official acts; and so, when Christ died and was crucified, the whole Church was looked upon as having died—as having been crucified with him. When Christ arose again, and ascended into heaven, and was thereby proved to be the *justified—accepted* with the Father—the whole Church was looked upon as then having risen again, being justified and accepted by the Father; and so of Christ's other official acts and undertakings.

But not only was the sin of Adam, with its immediate fearful consequences of condemnation and death, thus upon all his posterity, but Adam transfused his own evil nature upon each and all his posterity also, and that in the way of natural generation. For we see like begetting like in the various species of animals, whether we take our examples from the domestic ones, with which we have more immediately to do, or

E

whether we go to the savage tenants of the forest. We find thus lions and tigers begetting lions and tigers, so that the young cubs indicate, from their *very first being*, that they possess instinctively the savage nature of their particular species. So Adam, after his fall, is said to have begotten his offspring after his own likeness; hence the infection by nature, or the total and radical corruption of the whole human family. For, as Christ said, "that which is born of flesh is flesh," even that flesh of which Paul predicates, "that in it dwelleth no good thing," and which is "the sin that dwelleth in him;" and, indeed, that human nature became thus suddenly and universally corrupt, and that the depravity of the human heart was not by slow and gradual development, but that it reached to its height and excess, "*ad saltum*," as the saying is, that is, all at once, is clearly demonstrated by the very first notably recorded sin, being that of the very blackest character that can stand out in the annals of crime, even that of fratricide; see Gen. iv. 8. Just so was the righteousness of Christ, with all its most blessed consequences of free and complete justification and life, &c., upon all his elect Church. But Christ, moreover, transfuses his divine nature into each member of his redeemed people, and that, moreover, after the manner of spiritual regeneration. And here also we have the example of like begetting like; for as the Holy Ghost overshadowing the Virgin Mary, it was said by the angel that hence the "Holy thing which should be born of her, should be called the Son of God;" or in other words, the Holy Ghost should so possess the human nature of Christ, and fill it from its very first infancy, as to render it perfectly "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" just so, every one of those redeemed in Christ, is so born again, as that the Holy Ghost overshadowing their souls, begets in them the holy nature of Christ, and of which new birth by the Spirit St. John, in his first Epistle, third chapter and ninth verse, thus affirms—

“That whosoever is thus born of God *doth not commit sin*, for his seed remaineth in him, and he *cannot sin*, because he is born of God;” or, as Christ has said, “that which is born of the *Spirit is Spirit*”—that is, it hath nothing of the flesh or corruption mixed up with it, but like its great spiritual Father, is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. And if any person should ask, Nicodemus-like, “how can these things be?” We can only reply with the illustration of the Saviour, like as “the wind bloweth where it listeth,” &c.; and we know its existence but by its effect, namely, by “hearing the sound thereof; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.”

There is a great analogy existing between the natural and the spiritual birth. “In the first place, as we know not how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child”—that is, as we know natural existence only by its effects—so, in the same manner, with the spiritual existence. And thus as the first effect, or evidence of the former, when the child is born into the world is the cry partly of pain, and partly of hunger; and, moreover, as the way to appease that cry is to let the child partake of the food provided for it by nature, (even the same food which supported it whilst being carried in the womb, only, as physicians tell us, that the lacteal vessels are now transferred to the mother’s breasts,) just so the existence with the spiritual child into the spiritual world is first denoted by the cry of spiritual pain and sorrow, even by the cry of that godly sorrow, leading to repentance, that needeth not to be repented of; and by the cry of pain, even that which hungers and thirsts after righteousness; and, moreover, the way to appease this cry of sorrow and of hunger, is to have recourse to that remedy given by Peter, (Peter ii. 2,) where he desires his converts—“as new-born babes,” to desire (the Greek word means to desire with the same avidity with which the child desires the milk at its mother’s

breasts) "the sincere (that is the pure, unadulterated—viz., with any traditions of men, &c.,) milk of the word, that you may *grow thereby*."

This last advice coincides with the prayer of the collect—"That we may not only hear, read, mark, learn, but also *inwardly digest* the Scriptures." For as there is in nature sometimes that disease incident to human beings called an *atrophy*, which means that a man may devour, with voracious appetite, ("a wolf in the stomach,") a great quantity of food, and still never grow, or be the better, but rather the worse for it; so also in the spiritual world there is, but too often, it is to be feared, a spiritual atrophy, whereby persons are continually taking in fresh food into their spiritual stomachs, without so digesting it, as to exhibit any due and proper growth in the grace of practical godliness, &c. Thus many persons are in the habit of wandering about from pulpit to pulpit, and from platform to platform, hearing sermons and speeches from a great variety of speakers, even to that which might be well called a *spiritual surfeit*; and this is, more especially, peculiar to persons resident in large cities, whither every popular preacher and missionary deputation resort to; according to the warning of the apostle, such are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." And as there is no parent but what would deeply lament being obliged to rear up a family of dwarfs, but would desire, on the other hand, to supply such food to them, from time to time, as, under Providence, would enable them to grow up to the stature and proportion of perfect men; so believers are supplied out of the Word of God—that most bountiful store-house of all grace—not only with "milk for babes, but with the strong meat" of the Gospel, that thereby they may grow up to the full stature and proportions of the perfect man in Christ.

I will now point out these two natures that are derived from the above two sources, and which two natures

are found existing in every real Christian, although with endless variety of circumstances, according to the measure of grace bestowed on each individual believer. The first is the nature derived from Adam, which is *always sinning*; the other is the nature derived from Christ, and which *never sins*. The one admits of no reformation or renewal, the other admits of continually-increasing spiritual growth and advancement; the one is complete darkness, the other is complete light in the Lord. The believer is a complex character: he has two seeds within him; he has the "seed of the serpent and he has the seed of the woman;" he is born of the flesh and he is born of the Spirit; he is part of hell and part of heaven; he is devil-possessed and God-possessed. As Christ said to the Jews—"Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye do;" and again, "Ye are of God, and the works of God ye do;" the believer has a law in his members which wars with the law of God in his mind, and yet he also delights in the law of God after the inward man. Such is the believer, according to these two natures. He is an anomaly—a contradiction to himself and to others; one moment obeying the carnal affections of the flesh, another moment obeying the godly motions of the Spirit; one moment under the influence of temptation, in the lowliest valley of sorrow, of worldliness, and almost of despair; and again, the next moment, carolling the songs of Zion on the summit-level of holy hope and joy, "singing and making melody in his heart unto the Lord:" one day wandering amidst the mountains of Israel, in darkness, in solitude, and in alarm; another day basking in the full light of heaven's sunshine, holding sweet fellowship with the saints on earth, and partaking of (mysterious privilege!) converse with God on high, having the joy of the Lord as his strength, being "valiant for truth," and thinking his "mountain to stand so strong that he never again shall be moved." And as these natures are

so opposed and contrary the one to the other, that there can be no blending or making them agree in harmony and love, one to the other; for, as the apostle says, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, or what communion hath light with darkness, and what concord hath Christ with Belial?" And so far, indeed, from any amalgamation or coming together, in the way of friendship, of these two natures, on the other hand, there is a constant struggle, conflict, and antagonism between them. Indeed, such is the antagonism that exists between these two natures—so "contrary is the flesh to the spirit"—that Paul, putting himself into the attitude of the contenders in the Isthmean games, declares he kept his body under, and brought it into subjection—namely, as the Greek word means, by striking it under the eye he knocked it down; but though the flesh be thus knocked under from time to time, yet it never can be so completely subdued, but that it will revive again, and try to get the advantage in its turn. Just like that fabled monster, Antæus, who, when knocked down, getting fresh strength from his mother earth, was obliged to be suspended in the air before he could be deprived of existence; so, we would say, not until the flesh is brought into that middle place between earth and heaven, so to speak, will it be completely overcome. Hence the necessity of believers tasting of death; not that there is anything of judgment in it, as respects themselves; there is no penal enactment in the case, for "there is no condemnation to them that are in Jesus Christ;" but as Christ himself, the great Captain of our salvation, "by death conquered him who hath the power of death—that is, the devil;" for, being bound for a time, like Samson in Gaza, who, bursting through that mighty fortress, arose at midnight and brought its brazen gates as trophies with him to the top of the hill, so our spiritual Samson, breaking through the adamantine fortress of the grave, arose at midnight, "leading cap-

tivity captive," &c. To use the language of the apostle, Christ was "declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead;" or, as in the same epistle he states it, "that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him." Why? Is it because he cannot be brought a second time to be legally bound under condemnation by the law for sin? Not only so, but chiefly because—to use the language of the Scriptures—"he was raised," as touching the human nature which he had assumed, "in the power of an *endless* life"—that is, to give our meaning more distinctly, he had conferred on human nature the gift of immortality; or, in other terms, the human body of the believer, passing once through the ordeal of the grave, can never die again. In this sense, Christ has brought life and immortality to light by his Gospel. Then this mortal shall truly put on immortality. Hence, then, also, literally and openly, shall that Scripture receive its fullest acknowledgment, even 2 Cor. v. 16; for we shall then know no man after *the flesh* any more; for Christ having been raised as the specimen of the *spiritual* man, so shall we, having our body fashioned after his glorious body, have our bodies perfectly spiritual—that is, they shall have that life in them which shall not know death any more.

Such, then, are the two natures which are in every believer; the one, perfectly good; the other, perfectly and radically bad: the one, perfectly refined, pure, and holy; the other, perfectly carnal, impure, and unholy: the one being the new man, which, "after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness;" the other being the "old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts." Such are the two natures; and the believer being thus a complex man, is dealt with by God after a complex manner, and is also to deal with himself according to this duplex character—that is, to explain more clearly what I mean, there is nothing

punitive or judicial in anything of God's providences, or appointments, or varied dispensations, with regard to the new nature within us—that which is his own creation—that which is born of God. There is nothing of penal enactment here; it could not be, forasmuch as there is no sin in that which is born of God within us; but here, on the other hand, everything that is loving, gracious, and kind, comes down from the Father of mercies for the support, the education, so to speak, or the training up in the way it should go, until, growing in grace as in years, it shall reach up to the full strength and proportion of the perfect man in Christ. Not so with the other nature: everything punitive, penal, and judicial is to light upon it, not only from the God of justice, but also from ourselves. We are desired to crucify the old man—that is, as crucifixion was not only a painful, but a lingering death, so we are to be putting fresh nails into the old nature day by day; for they that are Christ's are to be crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts, and everything in the way of judgment, or deep sorrow and trial, that comes down from the God of love upon his believing people, (to whom he had exhibited himself as a reconciled Father of mercies in the Gospel of his Son,) comes down upon them as the punishment of the old man, even that flesh which remaineth in the best and holiest on earth, and in which, according to the testimony of the Spirit, there dwelleth no good thing.

I do not mean to say that the believer can always thus separate between the two natures acting within him, or that he can distinguish with regard to God's providential dealings with the one nature and the other, as above described, or that it would be wise for the believer to be analyzing continually on such points; but still, as to the general theorem here proposed for consideration, I think that it would be right to reach unto as great accuracy as possible, whilst we are ready to leave the development of the practical results and expe-

rience for that future dispensation, in which we shall know even as we are known.

And now as our blessed Saviour instructed very much through parables, and as such teach much more popularly, if not more fully and more closely, than abstract argument, I shall try to conclude my observations, on this most important subject, through the medium of a plain and apposite illustration. Suppose we had before us several glasses, in one of which there was the very purest water, taken from the very best crystal fountain, and in other glasses some of the same kind of water, though in various quantities; and suppose in those latter vessels there was sand with slimy mud mixed up in various proportions likewise—that is, supposing in one vessel a great proportion of limpid water and very little sand, and also of very little slimy mud mixed with the sand; in the next vessel less of the water and more of the slimy mud; and so to go on with a gradual scale until, in the last vessel, we should have very little water indeed, but a great proportionable quantity of the slimy mud, &c. Now, in the above comparison we have an illustration of the human nature of Christ and that of believers, with the two natures, as existing under the various measures of grace or of faith received; for, in the first place, if we take the vessel filled with pure water, without any sand or mud, and let us shake it ever so much from the bottom throughout, the whole liquid still remains perfectly pure and undefiled. Thus was it with Christ, as he himself states, the devil came to him, but found nothing in him—that is, though agitated by Satan's temptations to the very utmost—witness, for instance, the temptation in the wilderness, in Gethsemane, and at the Cross, Christ was still holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners—that is, the devil found nothing in him—there was no material in Christ that the devil could work upon; for, like as the smith must have in his forge iron, as

the chief material to work upon, and the carpenter must have timber in his workshop to work upon, so sin is the staple commodity for Satan to work with, and unless he can find it he cannot ply his trade. But let Satan come to us believers, and agitate us with his temptations—viz., through the world and the flesh, and how soon, like the different vessels shaken as above described, will the sin which remains in the very best Christian on earth be mixed up with that which is holy—that is, that which is of Christ within us—the flesh and the spirit—the mud and the water commingling together, and that in each individual, according as the spirit may predominate over the flesh, or, *vice versa*, in each. Thus some, notwithstanding manifold trials, temptations, and perplexities are, nevertheless, so spiritual, unearthly, and heavenly-minded in their frames and aspirations as to appear to have reached nearly unto perfection, the flesh being comparatively so subdued without them; whilst others, on the other hand, have the flesh so predominating above the spirit within them, as not to be able to bear the slightest agitation from temptation, but that the spirit would seem to be completely clouded and destroyed; so that the passing observer would scarcely recognise such to be Christians at all; just like an ignorant person being placed at the Straits of Gibraltar, and seeing the surface tide flowing in so strongly and so perpetually from the waters of the great Atlantic without, would conclude that there was no ebbing tide in the Mediterranean at all; but the skilful mariner, letting down his sounding plummet-line, discovers the ebb-current flowing out at a certain depth below the surface.

I would wish to make two or three observations before I pass on to the consideration of my main subject from this, which I may call a kind of episode.

The first observation I would make is, that in the above illustration we have a kind of spiritual kaleide-

scope, which ingenious instrument is so constructed that, with a few materials being shaken, an endless combination is produced. Just so with the two materials in the vessels under the varied graduated adjustment, representing the two natures in the believer, endless variety and combination can be made out to suit the multiplied complexions, frames, and characters of Christian experience in each separate believer.

Another observation I would make is, that however impossible it may be for believers themselves so to keep separate the workings of the flesh and spirit within them, as to say, now I am acting purely after the spirit, and another time after the flesh, however commingled these two natures may be in the Christian's daily and hourly walks, yet Christ will take care to keep that which is *his own* creation within the believer's soul *intact*, from all the defilements of the flesh, so that it can be truly said that "he that is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God"—that is, that like as a chemist can, by his art, so analyse a compound substance as to decompose it into its original parts, so Christ, as the great spiritual Chemist, can and will decompose, or keep separate, that which is spiritual from that which is fleshly; or, to give a classical illustration, like the waters of the fabled Alpheus, which was said to flow through the ocean, and yet to keep its stream intact, or uncommingled with the briny substance all around it; so Christ will keep that which is his own, ever uncontaminated from the mass of impurity which may ever so much surround it.

A third observation I would make is, that we should be daily praying, even that simple prayer which is said to have converted so many thousand souls to Christ—"Father of mercies, for Christ's sake, grant us thy Holy Spirit;" that so, by daily accessions of the Spirit's influence within us, we might, (as we cannot wholly extirpate,) at least keep down, in proper sub-

jection, the corrupted nature within us ; or, according to the language of our beautiful collect, that “ the flesh being subdued to the Spirit, we may in all things obey his godly motions.”

Again, I would remark, that in order to keep the spirit with predominating influence within us, we should not merely with our lips, but *con amore* with our hearts, repeat this most necessary clause in the Lord’s Prayer—“ lead us not into temptation ;” that like the waters resting still in the vessels assumed above, we may not come under the frequent or powerful agitations of our fleshly nature ; for, let the besetting sin only meet with the besetting temptation, and who can say to what excess of riot or ungodliness we might be brought ; as, for example, the cases of Peter and of David ; or to quote the saying of that holy man of old, John Bradford, when seeing a fellow-sinner led to execution, he cried out—“ There goes John Bradford, but for the grace of God.” That apostolic warning should ever be sounding in our ears—“ Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.”

Another remark that I shall here make is, that let the work of the Spirit be in ever so little force in a believer’s soul, yet all the powers of darkness, the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil, ever so raging or dominant, never shall be able finally to prevail, so as to destroy this work once begun. To use the striking language of the great and good Archbishop Leighton—“ Let grace be within the Christian only as a spark amidst the surrounding waters of the ocean, yet the turbulent waves of that tempest-agitated element never shall be able so to overwhelm that spark as completely to extinguish it.” No, surely ; for if an earthly parent, whilst any strength remains in his arm, would not allow his infant child to be murdered before his face, without uplifting his arm for the defence of his helpless child ; so surely will not God the Father interpose to rescue,

even his babe in Christ, from the grasp of him who was a murderer from the beginning.

The last observation which I shall make here is, that we should be most slow in passing sentence upon others, whether such be Christian or not; we should ever remember the apostolic admonition, viz.: "to judge nothing before the time." We can be no judges what may be the difficulties which many have to encounter under peculiar circumstances, from the temptations of the flesh. Many that did begin to run well, afterwards through temptation, may fall away, and also so completely (like, for instance, to the incestuous person spoken of by Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, v. 1, or to those who so profaned the Lord's Supper as to get drunken at it, see 1 Cor. xi. 21,) and for so long a period that they would seem altogether to have apostatised, and to become lost, when suddenly they may recover again, and become shining lights in the latter days of their Christian walk, and of their godly experience. Of such kind we have the well-known example of the great St. Augustine, who, having been early instructed by his pious mother, Monica, in the ways of godliness, when he was afterwards grown up, plunged into a course of the most wanton profligacy and sensuality, so as almost to break his poor mother's heart, who, in a state of almost hopeless despair, coming to good Bishop Ambrose, tells out her tale of woe to him, the tears of bursting agony streaming in full tide down her cheeks; when he, comforting her, desired her to take hope, emphatically adding, that the child of so many tears was never yet a cast-away. I might conclude, by illustrating my subject by a phenomenon of nature, namely, that which the French call *la perte du Rhone*. That leading and fine river of France forms the outlet of the waters of the great lake of Geneva, from which it issues in great strength and width, where, after for some time pursuing its course, it suddenly dips and

seems lost for a large space under ground, when, suddenly emerging again, and receiving tributary streams and rivers, and washing the fine towns of Lyons, Avignon, Marseilles, &c., it discharges its mighty confluence of waters through many mouths into the sea. Just so with many believers who, through the manifold temptations of the world, the devil, and the flesh, may run for a period, an under-ground course of sin and dissipation, from which, by grace, at length delivered, they go onward in a course of more distinguished, of more consistent, and more persevering godliness than ever they had done, spiritually blessing and enriching many others by their pious example, and their holy conversation; of which we have two notable examples in those most devoted servants of their Lord and Master, namely, that of Colonel Gardiner, and that of the Rev. John Newton, of St. Mary's, Woolnoth, London. Of the former, Dr. Doddridge, his celebrated biographer, tells us that, after he had that almost miraculous vision which arrested him (like that of St. Paul) in the midst of his mad career of sensual dissipation, he shone forth with such a blaze of pre-eminent piety and extraordinary holy zeal, as to have thrown a halo of blessed influence on all that ever afterwards came within the sphere of his acquaintanceship and conversation; and that, too, perseveringly to the last moment of his mortal existence, even until the time when, as the brave warrior, in his country's cause, he let his life-blood stream forth in the battle of Preston Pans. With regard to the latter, who, in his auto-biography, declares of himself, that such was the low state to which his vices, at one time had reduced him, that the very negroes of Africa used to shun his society as noxious and disgusting; yet, how many there are amongst Christians who have reason to praise God for those outbursts of fervent piety and matchless love—the real spiritual *Cardiphonia*—which came forth as with an overflowing tide from his humbled and holy soul.

Or, if it would seem better to confine ourselves to Scriptural examples, let us take the case of him whom Paul calls his "son," as having "begotten him in his bonds," and to whom the Church of Christ owes the specimen of one of the most beautiful letters that has ever been written by the hand of an inspired or uninspired penman. My readers will, at once, anticipate that I mean the case of Onesimus, as given in that most touching Epistle of Paul to Philemon. Again: let us direct our attention to the case of her, who gave to the wayworn pilgrim-feet of him who always "went about doing good," the most genial and refreshing ablution they ever received, in the full flood of her penitential tears, as they poured forth in godly sorrow, warmly from her broken heart of contrition and of love; and who afterwards wiped them with the tresses of that hair, now no longer set up for adornment and attraction, to beguile giddy youth in the meshes of her sinful course; but which were let to flow neglected and dishevelled upon her neck. These examples are adduced not to give encouragement to persons to presume on the mercy of a gracious God, but to prevent the passing of an undue and too hasty judgment upon their fellow-sinners; as it is impossible for us to say what the controversy may be that takes place between the dying man and his God; yea, in the judgment of charity, we might hope that, even when the halter of execution may be around the neck, sometimes the Spirit of mercy may descend to the wretched culprit's soul, so as to open out in it, even at this, the eleventh hour, that light that can come alone from above, to reveal "the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Whilst we take up the remark of a celebrated writer, in reference to the dying thief—"that there is but the one example of a person so saved, in order that no man should presume; yet, blessed be God, there is the one example, that no man should despair"—may we trust that many a poor felon, like

him, has been saved under the very ribs of death. At all events, the maxim of the Saviour should be evermore remembered—"Judge not, and ye shall not be judged."

And now to return from this long digression, to the argument more immediately in hand—a digression which might be considered too long, were it not for the vast importance of the subject, which, after all, has been but incidentally and partially explained—a subject which, to do it ample justice, would occupy a whole volume in itself, forasmuch as in the proper investigation and demonstration of the two natures, even the flesh and the spirit, consists the whole arcana or analysis of Christian experience.

Another parallelism, in the way of contrast, between Adam and Christ consists in the *mode* that each was put upon his trial. Adam was put upon trial but for *one* act of obedience; Christ was put upon his trial for obedience to the *whole* law. Adam's one isolated act being only for *active* obedience; Christ's total performances being for *passive* obedience, as well as for *active*. Adam being tested under the most favourable outward circumstances; Christ having been tested under the most unfavourable outward circumstances. Adam tested in Eden, the paradise of God; Christ tested in the wilderness of the world. Adam having a helpmeet given to him for his solace and companionship; Christ left solitary and deserted. Adam having the presence and counsel of God, "even the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden;" Christ having been forsaken in his last agony even by God, according to that mysterious cry of alarm, I had almost said of despair—"Eloi, eloi—My God, my God, why hast *thou* forsaken me."

Another parallelism, in the way of contrast, between Adam and Christ, and the last that I shall here mention, is the *passiveness* of character and of spirit with which the respective bodies that have been covenanted

for, by these two great federal heads, receive the consequences which come upon them by virtue of such official appointment and relationship. To explain more simply what I mean—When Adam sinned, in breaking the one solitary prohibitory demand of the law, all mankind were seen so federally bound up in him, as to have sinned in him *without the consent* or will of any one of them being had or asked in the matter, which could not have been, since not one of the human family had been born when the offence was committed; all mankind were, therefore, *passive* respecting the deed. Just so, by congruity of parallelism, when Christ obeyed, all the redeemed were seen so federally bound up in him, *without the will or the consent of any of them* having been asked or had in the matter, which could not indeed have been, inasmuch as not one of them had been born when the contemplated obedience of Christ had been anticipatorily agreed upon in the eternal councils, as the future satisfaction to be offered to the divine justice for the many—yea, the all—and multiplied offences of the people of God in every age. Christ was, in this respect, the “Lamb slain before the foundation of the world;” and all the elect people of God are said to be thus or thereby “chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world” also. All the elect people of God, therefore, were *passive* when this council of peace was settled between the three persons of the Godhead in eternity, through the future covenanted righteousness of the Redeemer. As there was no *personal individual* appearance demanded for condemnation in the former case, but by “the offence of one, judgment came upon *all* mankind” *en masse* for condemnation, so, by parity of reasoning, no *personal individual* appearance could be demanded in the latter case likewise; but, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came down upon *the whole elect Church en masse* for the justification of life. As all mankind were judged *aggregately* in Adam, so all the elect were

F

justified *aggregately* in Christ. As *all accountability or moral responsibility* was taken away from all mankind, as touching their *condemnation in Adam*, so *all accountability and moral responsibility* was taken away from all the redeemed, as touching their *justification in Christ*. As the former were *vicariously condemned* in Adam, so the latter were *vicariously justified* in Christ.

I have been thus tempted to prolong to great lengths this parallelism between Adam and Christ, because upon the Scriptural truth, and consequent due proclamation of this great truth, stands out in due and proper relief to the other doctrines of the Gospel. The acknowledgment of our vicarious fall in Adam, and consequent vicarious recovery in Christ, forms the very genius and essence—the nut and kernel—of the whole system of the divine mercy, as exhibited to us sinners. It is the very starting-post of the Christian race for all peace, and godliness, and every divine benediction. It is the key-note which directs the whole harmony of grace, so that, as it is clearly sounded, (Rom xi. 6,) it gets its full and only proper signification—“And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwise work is no more work.”

One objection which may be here brought against me is, that I have confined myself within too narrow bounds of the Word, and that if I took a more discursive and enlarged view of it, I would not find this truth so clearly enunciated, or at all taken notice of in it. To this I answer, that, comparing the Scriptures to one of those large regions or fields of gold now being discovered in foreign lands, wherein, though the precious metal may be dispersed, in more or less abundance, throughout a whole district, yet some fortunate adventurers may light upon a certain part in which the gold may be more copiously and more easily procured than in other parts, and to which portion the ad-

venturer may be more than content to apply himself exclusively, as refers to the rest; so I acknowledge that I have seized upon that part of the field, wherein the treasure particularly and most abundantly lies hid, and that, therefore, I have felt inclined very much to limit myself to this most enriching portion of the Word, blessing God most graciously for the stores of spiritual wealth contained herein; not only quite sufficient to satisfy my soul, but the souls of the whole Christian world besides, with the unsearchable riches of Christ. And, indeed, where in the divine Scriptures can we expect the gold to be so accumulated as in the epistles, according to the promise of Christ to his disciples, that he would, after he ascended on high, pour down upon them the gift of the Holy Spirit, which would "guide them into all truth;" for the Holy Ghost "was not yet given, because that Christ was not yet glorified." As though Christ would say, that there were some parts, or doctrines, not yet fully *developed*, but that a veil of obscurity and *reserve* was to be left upon the minds of the Church, until the time appointed by the Father for the perfect revelation of the divine testimony to man. Seeing, then, that it is in the epistles we are to seek for the last and the most important addition of the mind of heaven, concerning those truths that bear upon the most important plan of man's salvation, in whose writings amongst these could we expect to find larger and clearer views of all-saving truth than among the comparatively voluminous writings of Paul; and of all his epistles, where could we expect the logical acumen of the mind of this great dialectician to burst forth more than in that one, which was written for the enlightened members of the Church residing at Rome, the capital city of the empire. Accordingly, we nowhere find that most important of all questions—"How can the sinner become just before God?"—so fully and so systematically reasoned out, as in this most splendid portion of the Word of God.

There is one difficulty, which remains to be solved; it is a difficulty which meets every person alike, whatever his Christian creed may be, excepting those who hold, at all hazards, the most open and complete universalism. The difficulty arises from the deficiency as to the number of those that are to be saved in Christ, with those that are the lost in Adam. The question may be supposed to assume somewhat of the following aspect:—According to the system of doctrine now laid down—namely, that God having determined to test the whole human family, not *individually*, but *collectively*, by the two great official *units* which he proposed to be the tested specimens of the respective bodies which each was to represent, *without* the *permission and voluntary engagement* of the persons thus federally covenanted for, then, if those that were thus condemned in Adam were *all* to be saved in Christ, there could be no ground for objection, as far as the justice and equity of such an arrangement was concerned; but since the number of the latter, when compared with the former, is stated in many parts of Scripture to be *so few*, then, if the above system be found to be true, how can the great Arbiter of the destinies of the human family escape from the charge of partiality, caprice, and injustice? In reply, I must resort altogether to that which the Holy Spirit has condescended to give, through our apostle, as his solution of this involved question. This answer we have contained in Romans viii. 29, 30, and it rests on the doctrine of the divine predestination and election—a doctrine, we are free to confess, to be quite inscrutable to the finite comprehension of the human intellect. When we would try to entertain this doctrine, we seem to have lying before us an ocean of mystery, at once shoreless and fathomless, of which no plummet-line of human reason has ever been able to sound the depths. Still the *fact* of the doctrine is altogether undeniable. It stands forth in such plain and palpable terms—is so

variously given, and so expressly defined in the Word of Truth—that it would appear hard for any mind to gainsay and contradict it, unless a mind shrouded by the dark clouds of the most obstinate prejudice and unbelief.

I shall now subjoin the statement above referred to, without further note or comment—"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Our Church has given her interpretation of this doctrine in her seventeenth Article, as follows:—"Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he has constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those, whom he had chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Therefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose, thus working in them by his Spirit in due season. They through grace obey the call, they be justified freely, they be made sons of God by adoption, they be made like the image of his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, they walk religiously in good works, and, at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity." Such are the only reasons which the Spirit of God, and our Church, following the leadings of the Spirit, have given to this question; and I am not careful to assign any other. And now, as I write not for the opposers of the doctrine of election, but for the upholders of it, according to the moderate Calvinistic interpretation given of the seventeenth Article by those, who are called the evangelical portion of our Church, it is not my intention to go into any deep discussion or controversy on this

point. I shall merely make this one remark—namely, that the very objection urged by his supposed disputant by the apostle, proves incontestably the Calvinistic interpretation of the doctrine of election. For what are these but the accusations of partiality and arbitrariness? and which accusation would have no foundation in justice, if the Arminian hypothesis were to be resorted to. There is, however, an aspersion brought against the upholders of the doctrine of the divine predestination which I think it here right briefly to notice: it is that which would bind up the evangelical interpretation given to it with the dogmas of *fatalism and philosophical necessity*. These are but *heathenish* dogmas, which resolve everything as being done by *blind fate or chance*; whereas the apostolic doctrines of predestination and election are, according to the Scriptures, (see Eph. i. 8,) founded in the *divine "wisdom and prudence."*

And here again, by the way, I would suggest that the introduction of such doctrines should never be suffered to lead to any jealousy or bitterness between parties, who may not be able to agree exactly in the particular view or statement that may be set forth; for, of all hatred, the "odium theologicum" is apt to sink the deepest—"tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ." Such is the variety of the phases and complexions of the human mind, that perfect agreement cannot be expected upon this subject, no more than on any other abstruse subject in divinity, or of the other sciences. There has never been invented a "Procrustes bed" that can suit all human minds, no more than all human bodies; and, therefore, it is better for all serious inquirers after divine truth to agree to differ on many points, than to have the harmony of love and of Christian charity severed and interrupted. According to apostolic admonition, we are desired to *speaking*, and, therefore, *a fortiori*, to *hold* the truth *in love*. True believers should ever have that beautiful and sublime

passage of the pious Cudworth in capital letters before them—"Truth and love," he says, "are the two most powerful things in the world; and when they go together they cannot easily be withstood. The *golden beams of truth, and the silken cords of love, twisted together*, will draw men on with a *sweet violence*, whether they will or no."

But there are two other reasons, why Christians should agree to differ on this most deep and mysterious subject. The first is, that the doctrine of the divine predestination and election, when moderately considered and discussed, seems scarcely to be any other than the doctrine of a special and particular providence, which no serious Christian will, of course, or can deny. And, secondly, every humble Arminian, and every holy Calvinist—however extreme his view of the abstract theorem may be, even though he should be, "*Calvino ipso Calviniores*"—will agree as to the number of those that are to be saved, inasmuch as they must unite on the point of the sanctification of the redeemed; they will both join in harmony with the declaration of the Lord—namely, "that unless a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven"—and, therefore will decide, that none but the regenerate can be saved, and that all that are so regenerate, shall eventually be saved.

Again I would remark, in passing, that the doctrines of the divine predestination and election, so far from filling our minds with hard and severe notions concerning Deity, should, on the other hand, inflame us with the greatest admiration of his grace, love, and tender compassion, inasmuch as, but for God's electing and predestinating interposition, *no part* of the human family could, according to the irreversible decrees of his justice against sin, be saved. To give a common yet popular illustration of this matter: When a sovereign exercises his prerogative of mercy, in pardoning a certain number of his subjects taken in the act of

rebellion, no person thinks of viewing his character as harsh, capricious, or severe, because he does not exercise his clemency *to all*, but lets the law take its course upon the remainder. The whole difficulty lies in a mystery far beyond the human understanding to ken, or to investigate—namely, in that of the *origin of sin*. That God could have prevented sin from coming into this part of his creation, there can be no question; as, likewise, that God, having permitted its introduction, could have, nevertheless, prevented its having so wide and so fatal a sweep among mankind; and, lastly, that those whom he elects for the exercise of his mercy, as “vessels made to honour,” have no *greater claim* on his compassion—have no more merit, in the way of any moral fitness for his favour—than those who were passed by, must be maintained, in all humility, by every one that has been thus rescued from destruction, and reserved as monuments of everlasting grace and salvation.

But once more; not to attribute this exercise of his omniscience, to Deity, would be, to set God before our minds in a worse attitude, than that of any common father of a family, who must be supposed to know every member of his family, perhaps even the distant relations and connections, much more his own sons and daughters; and, above all, him whom he writes down as the future heir of his estates. Or, again: what person, deserving of the privilege of friendship, will not have an intimate acquaintance with all those whom he may wish to put down in the selected category of his peculiar friends? And, again: what general would be considered worthy of the high post of military authority committed to him, who would not know the number of the forces under his controul, or who would not have the name of each soldier enlisted, regularly entered on the muster-roll, and which muster-roll he will have regularly called over by the subaltern officers of each

regiment? But do not one and all these cases illustrate our positions? And as real Christians, must we not say, “*de le fabula narratur.*” Indeed, the parable so plainly applies, that no further comment is here necessary. But are there not analogies in the Word of God that describe to us, in the way of symbol, these doctrines of the divine predestination and election? What means otherwise that precise direction given to Moses concerning the erection of the tabernacle, when he was told to make it according to the pattern given to him on the mount, and which pattern he was exactly to follow to the making of the very pins of it, and of which the specimen, or representation, was given to him? Now, when we consider that this tabernacle was meant to be a type of the Church of God, why was the command given for such minute exactness for its construction, but to show that God had the whole of his elect Church previously designed and arranged before the eye of his omniscience, even to the very least, the meanest, and most insignificant member of that Church.

And, once more: have we not the fore-ordained order and arrangement in the divine proceedings of the elect Church, still more graphically pointed out to us in that mysterious rule adopted in the erection of that most wondrous structure ever built in this world, I mean, of course, “the temple of Solomon,” where, it is stated, that “the house, whilst it was being erected, was built with stone, so made ready before it was brought thither, that there was neither *hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house, whilst it was in building?*” Now, did not this most unprecedented mode of building demonstratively prove, as respects Solomon, that according to the miraculous endowment of wisdom granted to him, he had the whole of this complex and mighty temple, in each of *its minutest parts*, so developed before his mind, that he was able to see how the numerous workmen under

him—"even the four score hewers in the mountains, and the illimitable multitude of carvers in the quarries," &c.—should have had all the parts, assigned to each individual for completion, so perfectly hammered out, and adjusted, that those parts, when brought together, could so conjoin and dovetail, the one within the other, as to fill up the niche, or place allowed for it; and that, moreover, so perfectly, as that none of the rude and noisy hammerings, which seem indispensable to the comparatively clumsy and imperfect buildings amongst men were here necessary. Surely all this was intended, not merely to excite our curiosity, or to set men conjecturing the way how such a vast pile could be so managed; but it was meant to point out to us, in the way of symbol, how He, who is the spiritual Solomon, has his Church *so minutely* ordered, and predestinated, as to be preparing, through the ministration of his severally appointed workmen, each of the spiritual stones, taken out from the quarry of nature, to be so fashioned into living stones for his future temple, under the hammerings of that Word, which is said to "break the rock in pieces," as to have not *one stone too many or too few*; and that, moreover, that each stone shall be so blocked, or chiseled out for the place to be assigned to it, that in the next dispensation, when the great spiritual temple is to be erected, "which is yet to fill the whole earth," and upon the crown-summit of which, is to stand, everlastingly unfurled, the Cross of the Redeemer, Jesus Christ;" this great temple shall be so constructed of stones, so made ready before they should be brought thither, that there should be "neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron, so to speak, found in the house, when it shall be in building."

Now is the time for noise, commotion, and all bustle, excitement, and activity—now for the laborious plying of the workmen's hammers, and the other several graven tools used by the Spirit for the taking off, or

adjusting the various rough edges, and points, and angles, from those who are to form the living stones of the temple. *By and by*, when God's time for the raising up of the miraculous, spiritual edifice is to take place, then there must be a complete silence, and rest from all toil; everything, and part, and proportion having been so minutely defined and completed, according to the predestinating councils of God's wonder-working and fore-ordaining Providence. And is not the doctrine, we would now establish, but consonant to the prayer of the liturgy—namely, “that God would hasten his kingdom, and accomplish the number of his elect.” That just, as Solomon did not give orders to stay the workmen's hammers in the quarries of Hiram, until the *very last* stone necessary for the building of his temple had been taken out, so the Lord will not stay his commission to his spiritual workmen, whilst there remains *a single individual* of his chosen ones to be gathered out from among mankind.

III.—I shall now state some of the benefits that accrue by upholding the doctrine of justification under the particular phase or aspect here set forth and maintained. The first benefit that I should mention is, that it brings more honour to God, than any other view that can be given of this most important truth, inasmuch as it gives to Christ *alone*, the *whole* credit and work of the sinner's acceptance before God. The doctrine of the vicarious justification in Christ of sinners is the only phase of it that really magnifies the grace of God, and this it does most truly and effectually. This view of the doctrine enables the believer alone to see, and to appreciate “the things that are *freely* given to us of God.” Self-manifestation is the great end that God had in the creation of the world. He made all things for the setting forth of his glory; but there is nothing so morally exalts the divine character, before his fallen creatures here on earth, as his mercy and grace. Grace forms the very

brightest and largest jewel of that glorious coronet that encircles the brows of the eternal Majesty of Heaven. This is the real spiritual "Koh-i-noor"—that mountain of light, without whose shining, all the other attributes would be, for us, comparative darkness; and, moreover, in proportion, as this phase of justification magnifies the grace of God, in the same proportion it lays man's honour in the dust. It is the doctrine, of all others, that *hides pride from man*—that takes from under his feet every inch of ground for boasting before God, inasmuch as it excludes man altogether from having any hand or part in making out his acceptance with God. God having tried man *once*, and that for *one* solitary performance only, given under the most favourable circumstances for obedience, that he could have been put in, man failed; and God, determined *never* to test man again, but resolved to keep the whole matter, as touching man's life and salvation within the range of the divine undertaking, security, and performance; he, therefore, engaged with his Son to undertake in the sinner's place. Christ voluntarily stood the test in assumed human nature; and having perfectly fulfilled all righteousness, both passively and actively, and having ascended on high, was thus declared the justified, and accepted of the Father. We stand now vicariously justified and accepted in him. The well-known dream of the celebrated John Newton may be brought in as an illustration of the case before us. In one of his voyages to Africa, Newton tells us of a certain dream he had. He thought that he was leaning over the side of the vessel one night, with a beautiful ring in his hand, containing a jewel of great value and beauty; and whilst he held it admiringly between his fingers, behold he suddenly drops it into the ocean; but whilst he is mourning for his loss, never expecting to see his precious ring again, behold, in his vision, a person of most venerable and benevolent aspect suddenly arises out of the waters; and holding

up the ring to him, Newton eagerly stretches forth his hand, desirous to rescue it back, when the stranger replies—nay, you had possession of it lately, and you lost it, and if I were to intrust it to you again, the same result would follow. I shall, therefore, keep it for you, and it shall be always ready for you under my safe custody, whenever your need may require its restoration. Thus God committed the jewel of life to Adam's safe keeping; he lost it, and now man shall not have it entrusted to his guardianship, but God in Christ retains it for him secure, beyond all reach of temptation, or risk of loss, until the time appointed by the Father for the believer in the future dispensation of perfection to get possession of it himself; for to use the language of the Apostle, (Col. iii. 3,) our "life is *hid* with Christ in God: when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory."

A second great benefit that this phase of justification brings is, that it removes us from all *responsibility* in this matter. Taking our stand upon the high vantage ground of vicarious justification in Christ, we feel that we are hereby freed from all human accountability respecting our acceptance before him; for to quote the language of the Apostle, (Heb. x. 2,) "The worshippers, *once* purged, have no more conscience of sins." But this once purging was effected for us, according to the testimony of the writer, (Heb. i. 3.) *vicariously*, and, therefore, perfectly and *for ever* by Christ, wherein he states that Christ having purged our sins for ever, sat down at the right hand of God—that is, we are not afraid of any condemnation coming against us from God for them. We roll all our responsibilities here over on him, who hath undertaken before God for us; "the Lord hath laid on Christ the iniquities of us all." Christ engaged to settle this controversy with his Father for us. We should, therefore, have no anxiety here. Christ is the surety for his Church. He paid the *whole* debt, that to the

justice of God had been incurred; and, therefore, Christ's people must allow him to settle this account with his Father, without troubling themselves, in any respect, about the matter. They should cast their whole burden upon his shoulders, which are so strong and so broad, as to be able to bear up even the government of the entire universe upon them. They are called upon to cast all their care upon him, who hath here so greatly cared for them, as to discharge them altogether from having anything to do with this warfare. They have *no obligation* to settle with God for their *justification*. God has got his obligation, on this account, already from Christ, and he wants *no second* reckoning to be had at the hands of any believer for it. God's justice obtained its very fullest vindication from the vicarious satisfaction of the atonement of Christ—"God *was in Christ* reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses," &c. ; and nothing that man can do can add to, or take from, this perfect reconciliation. "There is now, therefore, no farther judgment to them that are in Jesus Christ." The Church has *already been tried, judged, and justified in him*, who has stood forth before the Father as its great moral representative, its risen and justified federal head. God has declared himself *fully satisfied* for all that has been thus done for the perfect justification of the Church, and we, as believing members of that Church, ought surely, therefore, be *more than satisfied*.

A third great benefit to ourselves, as arising out of this particular phase of justification, is, that it admits of no *apostasy*. This follows, as a necessary consequence, from the nature of vicarious substitution, as already explained; for, since we roll the whole onus of responsibility for justification upon Christ, so as to have *no act or part* in the business ourselves whatsoever, as there can be *no apostasy on Christ's side*, so there can be no apostasy on ours, who have bound

our whole spiritual interest and concern on this point with him alone. Deprecating, according to the introductory prayer of our liturgy, that God would not enter into judgment with us, acknowledging that "no man living could be justified in his sight," we make no personal appearance at all before God for justification, but stand upon the privilege of vicarious substitution, or covenant representation; but Christ, having undertaken to be, in this respect, the propitiation with the Father for his people, standing before an objecting world in this his representative character, declares that he will send the Holy Ghost to convince the unbelieving world, that he had perfectly fulfilled this his official engagement, inasmuch as that he was going to the Father, and the world should *see him no more*; by which remarkable declaration, it may be supposed, as though he had intimated that had he left any part of the work of atoning satisfaction incomplete, the Father would have sent him back again to finish that which he left so undone, and thus, so to speak, the world would see him again. But now, blessed be God, the doctrine, for the very highest Christian assurance, and privileged consolation, as respects any fear of apostasy, as well as other free mercies, is this—that Christ having been "declared the Son of God with power, by the *resurrection* from the dead," was, by that very act, declared to be the *justified* and the *accepted* with the Father; and that, therefore, his *whole elect Church*, for which he had thus officially undertaken, stood forth justified *in him*; and that, when *once* justified, it became eternally justified in him, according to the expressed declaration of Scripture—viz., that "he obtained *eternal* redemption for us;" and again, "by the *one* offering he had perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified." To *retract* any blessing imparted is not the way or conduct of the Deity. Our covenant God in Christ is not a *man that he should lie*, or the Son of man that he should repent. The doctrine of

eternal justification crowns, at once, the mercy of God, and the salvation of the righteous.

A fourth benefit, that this phase of justification confers on believers is, that it removes all *servile* fear from their souls. He who is in Christ for vicarious justification has, in the first place, no servile fear of God. I use the word *servile* advisedly, because that every humble believer has continually a *reverential* fear for the great Majesty of Heaven, and a *filial* fear for his fatherly kindness and mercy, lest he should do anything that might reflect upon, or impeach the tribute of loving and willing obedience, which we owe to him for all his fatherly mercy and kindness poured out upon us, so abundantly in the Gospel of his ever-blessed Son. But whilst we exercise such godly fear, as above described, we would carefully distinguish it from all feelings of *dread* and *terror* at the divine presence. The believer, though he thus fears God, is never to be *afraid* of God, for he has no qualms or alarms of conscience concerning anything, that may respect the pardon of his sins, or his free, full, and perfect justification. Why should he be afraid of God, who has now entirely pardoned, justified, and accepted him through the vicarious satisfaction of his Son? Has not Christ made God to be *at friends* with him? Is he not now at peace with God through Jesus Christ? Has not God gotten his entire reconciliation, atonement, and satisfaction? The believer, therefore, has not received the spirit of "bondage again to fear, but he has received the spirit of adoption, whereby he is enabled to cry out"—that is, with liberty, with boldness, and with the loudest triumph of joy and acclamation, (for such feelings may the Greek word here used be supposed to include, *κρᾶσις*.) Instead of servile fear, the "love of God is now shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him." He comprehends, experimentally, now the aphorism of the Apostle—"We love him because he hath *first* loved us." He, therefore, daily grows more

and more in the knowledge of "that perfect love that casteth out *all fear that hath torment in it*;" and that for the reason assigned by John why he should have boldness—even the same boldness, or liberty, which we have just now taken notice of—in the day of judgment—viz., "Because that, as he is (*i.e., as Christ is*) *so are we in this world*;" or, in other terms, because that we are *vicariously* justified in him; for Christ having been *now*, as touching his human nature, raised from the dead, and being ascended into heaven, stands forth there as the accepted and the justified specimen of humanity for his Church's sake; "he was raised again for *our* (*i.e., his Church's, not his own*) justification." And thus the believer being freed from all servile fear of God and of judgment to come, *hell* is a word now blotted out, as regards *his own personal concern*, from his Christian vocabulary; and as for *death*, so far from being looked upon, as *once* he was, in the days of his unbelief and ungodliness, as the *king of terrors*, he is now changed into one of his very best and kindest *friends*, who is about to deliver him for ever and ever from his never-ceasing but perpetually-warring tormentor, even *the flesh*, under which he now groans, being burthened—the flesh, in which dwelleth no good thing—the flesh, in which sin, "even that sin that doth so easily beset us," dwelleth. Death, or the grave, will prove, by and by, to all those who have fallen asleep in Jesus, to be like a great spiritual alembic, by which all that is perfectly pure and refined in spirit shall be drawn off, so that instead of servile fear of death, the Christian attitude should now be that of "looking for and hasting unto the day of Christ."

IV.—I shall now close this present section by replying to a few popular objections, which may be made against the statement of doctrine here enforced.

The first objection that I shall reply to is that which

G

would represent the plan of justification here proposed, as *too easy and too cheap*. Truly, forsooth, it may be said, that is a most easy, and ready, and expeditious way of securing heaven, namely, that which would propose our being accepted by *proxy*—by our not being required to shew a *personal* appearance before God at all, for acceptance in his sight; but by the church's being justified by what another has done, say eighteen hundred years ago, and by anticipatory fulfilment before the foundation of the world. Now this *simplicity* of the plan of the sinner's justification, is that which constitutes its greatest glory, forasmuch as it proves, beyond all reach of mental cavilling and ingenuity, (necessary to support the other systems now popularly in use,) that justification is perfectly *free and unconditional*. It thus shews "the things that are *freely* given to us of God." The great controversy that God has chiefly with us sinners is, that he has determined that "no flesh should glory in his presence;" hence he excludes the sinner from all personal appearance before him, and makes him to stand altogether for pardon upon the vicarious merits and righteousness of another.

If ever we are to enter through mercy's door, it must be through the substituted righteousness of him, who stood forth as our great friend in need, and has already fulfilled that righteousness for his people, the *very least particle* of which they never could have fulfilled for themselves. Compare Job xxii. 2, 3, with xxxv. 6-8. I now bring forward the celebrated challenge of Hooker, as bearing upon my point. "Suppose," says Hooker, "that God should make us an offer thus large:—Search all the generations of men since the fall of our father, Adam—find one man that hath done *one* action, which hath passed from him pure, without any stain or blemish at all, and for that one man's only action, neither man nor angel should feel the torments which are prepared for both;

do you think that this ransom to deliver men and angels could be found amongst the sons of men? Nay; the best things which we do have somewhat in them to be pardoned. How, then, can we do any thing meritorious, or worthy to be rewarded? We acknowledge a *dutiful necessity* of doing well; but the *meritorious dignity* of doing well we utterly renounce. The little fruit which we have in holiness, it is, God knoweth, corrupt and unsound; we put no confidence at all in it; we challenge nothing in the world for it; we dare not call God to reckoning, as if we had him in *our debt-books*; our continual suit to him is, and must be, to *bear with our infirmities*, and to *pardon our offences*.

Another objection that will naturally be made, is that which will be made to bear upon those tenets in which I denied man to have any accountability or responsibility in the matter of his *primary* justification before God, and that therefore there can be no apostasy from this state of salvation in Christ. Against these views, such Scriptures as the following will be sure to be brought up in remembrance against me, namely, that in 2 Cor. v. 10—"We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." And that no less remarkable one in 1 Cor. ix. 27, wherein Paul says of himself, that "he kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest by any means, whilst he preached to others, himself should be a cast away." I have selected these two texts from amongst numerous others, as being the very strongest and most direct upon the objection before us; and therefore the answers, which I may be able to give to these, must be thought sufficient, as specimen answers, that might be made against all others of similar import, as it would be by far too tedious to reply to each, *seriatim*; and more especially, as all the other leading ones

which shall be considered, God willing, in the next volume, which (being as proposed) shall bear more directly on the *practice* of the Gospel, such enquiries as those now to be answered, would seem to belong rather to it than to the present one, which was meant to be chiefly doctrinal in its character. Though here I may be allowed to make a remark in passing, that it would seem to be almost impossible to treat of the doctrines of the Gospel so exclusively, as to shut out altogether from consideration the practice of the Gospel; every doctrine, when properly understood, and spiritually embraced, being a doctrine unto godliness, and the same remark, *vice versa*, will hold good.

To take the first of the above texts, viz. 2 Cor. v. 10, I give the following four-fold answer to the objection founded thereon. First,—That if my arguments in support of the doctrine of vicarious justification in Christ of sinners be admitted, as based upon the foundation of Scriptural truth, then whatever meaning may be attached to the above text, it cannot interfere with the great statement advocated in this section, unless we come to the preposterous conclusion, that the Spirit of God can set forth tenets altogether contradictory of one another. Second,—We find the Spirit of God positively affirming, that “there is no *judgment* to them that are in Jesus Christ.” Third,—That if there was to be a judgment, yet according to Christ’s promise to his Church, that there should be “no spot, nor wrinkle, nor blemish, nor any such thing” discovered in it; but that it shall be presented yet *faultless* before the presence of God’s glory, and that not because of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness put upon it, as the doctrine is often so erroneously stated, as because, according to the declaration given in Rom. viii. 4, the righteousness of the law should be found fulfilled *in* (and not *for*, viz., by external imputation, &c.) them who walk

not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; and that, because as we have reasoned out the matter, death having proved to be like the spiritual percolator, or alembic, all that was *flesh*, *i.e.* sin, in them, has been utterly and for ever destroyed in the grave; so that they would thus appear before the judgment-seat of Christ with that which is *born of God* in them, and which can sin no more than its great spiritual Parent, the Holy Ghost. Fourth,—If we read down the context where this verse occurs, we should find it placed as one amongst the many privileges, or reasons, why the most immediate and sudden deaths should be preferred, which could never be the case if the usual acceptation given to this passage was found to be correct; for if not only all the delinquencies which the best men must, during their continual strife, have been guilty of, but even those, say of a month, or a week, yea, or even of a day were to be brought up in remembrance against them, then death, so far from being a cause of desire and of joy, would become that of terror and alarm to the very holiest saint upon earth. And moreover, what then would become of the most gracious promises, namely, those which declare that God casteth all the sins of his people behind his back—into the depths of the sea—so as that they should never be discovered to be brought any more in remembrance against them; that he blots them out as a cloud; and those other numberless texts replete with the declarations of the freest, fullest, and most universal amnesty, pardon, and not only forgiveness, but *forgetfulness*, likewise, of all that is past.

Well, then, seeing that you reject the common interpretation of a Scripture, so plain, and palpable, and express in its terms, that “he who runneth may read,” it will be asked, what meaning, then, do you assign to it? Though I hold as strongly and decidedly, as words can afford me utterance, that there

is no *personal* appearing for the believer at the bar of Christ's judgment-seat for *justification*; still I hold as strongly and as decidedly, there will be a personal appearing at the bar of Christ's judgment-seat, as touching his *sanctification*. As regards the former, it is our privilege to be without fear or jeopardy—without responsibility, or any dread of apostasy whatsoever; but with regard to the latter, all responsibilities, fears of apostasies, are to come up before our minds and consciences, &c. Now it is with this latter judgment, as respects believers, that the two texts here adduced, with others of a similar character, have to do. That there is to be a reward according to works, for every believer, is as expressly stated in the Word of God as any other doctrine whatever; for if we take the parable of the talents or pounds, &c., we can have no mistake on this subject. Here is found full scope for all our energies, our laudable ambition for advancement, honours, and distinction—here is found the widest play for the exercise of all human ability, free agency, fear of not having attained perfection, and in a word, for the whole “work of faith, the whole labour of love, and the whole patience of hope.” Hence, when St. Paul places as amongst the many reasons why he desires to depart at once and be with Jesus, as far better, than to remain any longer here, his standing at the judgment-seat of Christ, it is because, independently of his getting rid of the burden of the flesh, he expected to reap then the reward of all those labours, which he performed more abundantly than all the rest of the apostles.

And here we have a beautiful harmony, or coincidence, with the doctrine now laid down, in that splendid anthem that meets us in our Morning Service, called the “Te Deum,”—(Dr. Cumming, although a dissenter from the Established Church, considers this anthem as all but inspired,)—in which we find

the following language:—"We believe that thou shalt come to be our *Judge*." What then; doth the idea excite fear, or any other like feeling, that would make us draw back from the subject? Nay, mark the petition which follows:—"We therefore pray thee, help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood; make them to be numbered with thy saints, *in glory everlasting*." We might here also refer to Heb. xii. 23, in which paragraph of Scripture, amongst the other privileges of coming to Mount Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem, is also included that of coming to God, the *judge* of all, which last would not be put amongst the inventory of blessings, was the usual interpretation annexed to the Scripture now under debate to be the true one.

But it will be asked, how I can reconcile the interpretation I have now given, with the words that follow, namely,—“Knowing, therefore, the *terror* of the Lord, we persuade *men*.” This latter language of the Apostle is addressed to unbelievers, (and not believers,) to whom alone the judgment-seat of Christ can be an object of terror. That it was unbelievers the Apostle meant by the word “*men*,” will appear still more from the language used immediately afterwards—"But *we* are made manifest *unto God*," i.e. manifested so before him, as not to fear standing at Christ's judgment-seat; or in other words, we have the evidence of being manifested before God as true believers in his Son, and therefore as the expectants of the rewards of grace at his hands, and not of condemnation. See Rom. viii. 1, &c.

We know from several passages of the Apostle's writings, that Paul declared the second coming of the Lord Jesus to be for a double purpose. He is to come as the *avenger* as well as the Saviour. He is to come for the *glorification* (not for the calling of them to an account for any of the *bad* works they might have done whilst in the mortal body, all of which

have been blotted out from the book of God's remembrance *for ever*, by his own precious blood, and for which bad actions they might otherwise have remembered themselves with alarm, expecting to receive condemnation or destruction at the bar of Christ's judgment-seat) of his saints, and for taking vengeance of his enemies, &c. (See 2 Thess. i. 6-10.) In Heb. xii. 29, Paul states, that God out of Christ is but *a consuming fire*; whilst God in Christ is *love*. To give a plain illustration: in consequence of the interposing atmosphere, the sun sends down his rays so upon the earth, as to have them exercise a benign influence in the way of light, heat, and life upon it; as without it they would be only for burning and destruction. Just so God, through the healing atmosphere of reconciliation in Christ, as the spiritual Sun, shines down upon believers with healing in his wings for spiritual light, and heat, and life, and every spiritual blessing; but without such intervention of mercy, all must be for consumption and burning. The good and bad spoken of in the text, refer not, therefore, to the good and bad actions of believers, forasmuch as Christ then will recognise nought, but that which is good, in those that have believed in him, even all things, that have belonged to the Spirit, that has worked in them; for all the flesh will then have been left behind in the grave. So with regard to those who have died in unbelief, there will be nought then recognised by Christ upon them but that which is bad; that is, that was of the flesh only, they never having been possessed of aught of the Spirit.

But the reasoning on this point is quite cumulative; and, therefore, if any thing more were necessary to prove to demonstration that the interpretation which I have here set forth is the Scripturally correct one, I have reserved two of my most crowning arguments for the last. The first is the notable challenge given by Paul, Rom. viii. 34—"Who is he that con-

demneth?" not Christ, who has died, yea, rather who has risen again, and that for the vicarious justification of his people, as Paul before stated in Rom. iv. 25—"Who was delivered for *our* offences, and was raised again for *our* justification." Therefore Christ, instead of being looked upon under the aspect of the frowning Judge coming to take cognizance of their evil deeds done whilst in the mortal body, shall then be looked upon by all such, as their Justifier, their Acceptor, and their Rewarder.

The second crowning argument arises out of the consideration of the bodies, in which believers are to take their stand at the judgment-seat of Christ, which shall be no less than those bodies fashioned after Christ's own glorious body, and to be clothed with which, forms now the great hope and fervent prayer of every true Christian. This makes the Christian's attitude to be, therefore, that of the very greatest desire, even that of "looking for, and hastening unto, the coming of the day of Christ."

I have been the longer and the more elaborate in my exposition of the above text, because of the sad mangling which I have often heard it getting at the hands of even otherwise evangelical preachers, who constantly use it for the sake of exciting alarm in their hearers, by bringing up before their minds, through it, the apprehension of having to take their trial at the bar of Christ, as though all, even their most secret actions, and thoughts, and principles, were to be summoned up in fearful array before them, rather than making this text the ground-work of the very loftiest hopes, privileges, and desires of all the true servants of God.

Something of the same line of argument will apply to the second text here adduced, viz.—1 Cor. ix. 27. That it could not be any thing of the final apostasy from the faith of Christ that Paul meant here, must be evident. First, from that precious doctrine, so

clearly enunciated for the comfort of all believers, as we have now argued from his own writings, namely, that of their vicarious justification in Christ. Secondly,—From the consideration of the illustrations here used, viz., that of the boxer, and the runner in the Isthmian games, which would shew that Paul, as speaking of himself in this passage, proved that he must not only have been possessed of spiritual life, but moreover, that life, under the influence of its very highest power, discipline, training, &c., all which qualities were essentially necessary as to natural life, in the contenders for the honours in the above-named celebrated games. But if such that had so far attained, could be finally the casts-away, where then would go all those splendid promises for the final preservation of God's people, even as given by Paul himself. (Compare Rom. viii. 31-39, with Phil. i. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Thirdly,—Let us consider the combatants here introduced by the Apostle, and we shall see that the contest is between the flesh and the spirit; and which contest, therefore, can only take place within the experience of true believers, inasmuch as in them only, this double nature exists, and of which he gives us an account in Rom. vii. 14-24, Gal. v. 16, 17. Fourthly,—It can be satisfactorily proved, that the Epistles in general are addressed to true believers, and therefore we argue, that of such, none can be the *finally* lost. Compare John x. 27-29, with John xvii. 12-24, &c. And if it be asked, if there were no apostates amongst the members of those churches, to which the apostolic Epistles were addressed, I shall allow John to answer the question. In his first Epistle, ii. 19, he thus decides the matter:—"They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not *all* of us."

The whole jet of the application of the illustrations

here used, proves that Paul was not contending here *for* life, but *from* life—not *for* justification, but *from* justification. In a word, he wished, as every real Christian will wish, not to use his justification as an *end*, but only as a *means* to an end: that is, just as God gives us natural life not as an end, but as a means to an end: namely, that as natural life being in full growing healthy exercise within us, so should we go out in its power to perform actively and usefully the several engagements that belong to our respective occupations. Just so the God of grace gives us spiritual life, and the increasing growth of it, in order that we may be engaged energetically and honourably, in running the race set before us in Christ, “being not slothful in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.” It was to this kind of industry the Apostle wished to be stirring himself up to; or as he has it in Phil. iii. 13, 14—“That forgetting the things that were behind, and reaching forth to those things which were before, he was pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Moreover, just as in natural life a man would strive legally to get out of his way, whatever antagonist might come up and oppose him in the performance of his necessary duties; just so, the Apostle borrows the illustration to show how he tried to resist, or to get out of his way, that which was constantly coming up in antagonism against him, in fighting the good fight of faith—namely, the flesh, or the body of sin, as he, elsewhere, calls it; and which, therefore, he kept under, and brought into subjection. In fine, whilst Paul could have had no fear as to his final acceptance at the hands of Christ, his Judge and Saviour, he did, humanly speaking, fear, lest through indolence, or any other besetting sin, he might cease from all those almost superhuman exertions of mind and body, in not only doing but *suffering* the whole will of God, and whereby he was labouring more abundantly than all the

apostles, in order to secure, at his hands, who graciously declared—"that a drop of cold water given in his name to a disciple, should in no wise lose its reward"—that crown of righteousness, which he expected should encircle, consequently, his immortalised brows.

A third objection that may be brought, most likely, against the doctrine of free and eternal forgiveness in Christ is, why believers, under such a view, should still be making continual confessions of sin, and asking for renewed pardon, as such are called to do, more especially in the public prayers of our Church Service, whose liturgy is made up so much of supplications, humiliations, intercessions, &c. The answer to this objection shall be four-fold :—

First—The more entirely we feel the mercy of God on us, in freely pardoning our most numerous offences, the less we can forgive ourselves for ever having offended against so benign and gracious a Creator ; and, therefore, the more we shall ever feel of that godly sorrow that worketh repentance, not to be repented of.

Secondly—After all, we are but obeying an express command of Scripture, and to this I shall ever bend, rather than to the dicta of any system-builders, however I may seem thus to expose myself to accusations of legalism, inconsistency, or of any other charge whatever. Take, for instance, the text put by our reformers, at the commencement of our liturgy, from 1 John i. 8, 9—"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us, but if we *confess* our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Now, if we read down the whole paragraph, we shall find the apostle speaking of persons who have been already justified in Christ, and, therefore, of those who have already been forgiven their sins.

Thirdly—Such confessions, supplications, and inter-

cessions, &c., are for the purpose of carrying on the work of sanctification in the believer's experience, and not for the purpose of his seeking justification at the hands of God. In corroboration of this our view, I shall just quote one text, even that of 1 John i. 7—"If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth (mark, not hath cleansed, it is the *present*, not the *past* tense, which proves a continuous work to be going on) from all sin." To whom does the Apostle address his admonition? Is it not to those who want the blood of Christ to be applied to them for their justification, or is not rather for those who were the already justified in Christ? even to those, whom he testifies that they were already "walking in the light." And here we would remark, in passing, the most erroneous application made perpetually of this most frequently repeated Scripture, which is referred as appertaining to the *justification* of sinners before God, and not to their after-*sanctification*, as the Apostle here uses it. If it be asked how the blood of Christ can be said properly to sanctify, as well as to justify, God's people? I answer—it is not only by removing our daily and hourly contracted guilt, which would otherwise come with such overwhelming, cumulative pressure, as to weigh down the soul with doubt and despondency; but, also, by deepening our humility—which continual confessions, &c., have a direct tendency to produce—by magnifying the love of God in his bearing with such rebellious creatures, as the very best of us are, and by other ways producing holiness.

Fourthly—Reference to the history of the day of atonement, as in Lev. xvi., will throw much important light upon the subject now before us. On that day the high priest, putting off his gorgeous vestments, and clothing himself in the *white linen garments*, (emblematical of Christ's sinless humanity,) was to

go within the Holy of Holies, with the blood of the animal slain in the outward court, and sprinkling that blood seven times before the mercy-seat, he was to make atonement for the sins of the people; he was also to take the perfumes of sweet spices, and to burn them on the mercy-seat; and then, having made intercession for the people, he was to come forth, putting on his gorgeous high-priest's vestments, to bless the people. Moreover, whilst he was performing the service within the veil, it is expressly declared, in verse 17—"There shall be *no* man in the tabernacle of the congregation, when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place." Now, as the Apostle declares in Heb. x. 1—"The law being the shadow of good things to come," we can see, in all this, something to make known to us, more distinctly, the peculiar office-work of Christ, as our risen High Priest. First, we distinctly see how *no* part of the priestly office-work was performed by Christ on *earth*.* Any person, even though not of the sons of Levi, might have slain the victim in the outward court—this formed no *essential* part of the high priest's official undertaking, otherwise if it were indispensable that he, or the sons of Levi, should slay the victim, then Christ, as the antitype, should have either slain himself, or else the priests of the law should have put him to death. Again: let the victim be selected ever so perfectly, without spot or blemish, as long as its blood poured into the consecrated lever remained in the outward court, no atonement was made; therefore, the High-priest under the law did not begin, *bona fide*, the work of atonement, until he entered within the veil with the blood of the victim slain in the outward court. So Christ, as the great antitype, did not actually commence his office, undertaking as our high priest, until he entered within the veil above, not with the "blood of goats and calves,"

* Note F.

but with his own blood, there to obtain eternal redemption for his people. Secondly—he is there now letting this his sacrifice to ascend, as a sweet-smelling savour, before the throne of God; or, to use the language of inspiration—“He ever liveth to make intercession for his people.” And, thirdly, whilst the work of atonement is going on, no man is to appear in the tabernacle of the congregation—that is, no human appearance must be here—we are not to stand for *personal* justification before the throne of God; the whole work of atonement must be performed by our High Priest *alone* within the veil; we must plead by *proxy* at the bar of grace; in other words, the doctrine of *vicarious* justification in Christ for sinners is here typically set forth. But what were the people to be doing whilst the high priest was carrying on the work of atonement within the veil? We turn to the twenty-ninth verse, and there we find the day of annual atonement was to be a day of universal, public humiliation throughout the land; and, moreover, it was the only day in the whole year appointed for that purpose, by the express will of heaven, though the Scribes and Pharisees afterwards, by the tradition of the elders, superadded many other days for fasting and humiliation, just as the Romish priests do now, thereby, as Christ declared, “Making void the law of God by their traditions.” Just so, as Christ is yet within the veil, carrying on the work of atonement for his people, and will be there during the whole of this dispensation, so this present period of our existence must be considered by us as the antitypical day of atonement; and hence, confessions, humiliations, and such like godly exercises now become us.

But here, further, we would remark on the superior privilege which we, as believers, who live under the Christian dispensation, possess above those who were living under the legal covenant; for, whereas, history informs us that the Jewish high priests went with fear and trembling within the veil, not knowing but that

death, not life, might await him there from the hand of God, justly incensed against him for the non-performance of the *whole* ritual service, according to the exact model prescribed to him in the law, whether such oversight might occur, either from wilful negligence, or from the infirmity of forgetfulness. What nervous anxiety must, moreover, have taken possession of the minds of the people until they saw the high priest coming forth from the tabernacle, having the due sacrifice accepted, both for himself, and for the congregation. How different the feelings and position of us, believers, under the new covenant, when, being assured of the perfect offering and consequent acceptance of our great High Priest above, we are desired to "come with boldness, (that is, with liberty,) to the throne of grace, to obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

Once more referring to the type now before us, we would remark what joyous exultation must not have seized upon the minds of the Jewish worshippers, when the day of atonement was over, and with it all the commanded observances for fasting and humiliation, &c. Just so, I would say, should we, Christians, by anticipation, feeling that our day of atonement was over, in heart and mind thither ascending, where our Saviour has gone before us, be found, according to the exhortation of the apostle, to be "rejoicing always in the Lord," and to us, more especially, who are living at the closing period of the present dispensation, should exuberant exultation occasionally burst from us, when we think that the day of the Lord draweth nigh—even that glorious day, when the Lord Jesus Christ, descending from the heavens with ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands in his glorious train—that day when "we shall see the King in his *beauty*, and by seeing him become *like* him, even when he shall change our vile bodies, and fashion them after his own glorious body, &c.—that day which, as it will form

the day of the Church's consummation for all bliss, and immortality, and glory, so it forms the subject-matter of her concluding song and prayer—"Come, Lord Jesus, even come quickly."

A fourth objection may be put, after the following manner:—According to your doctrine of vicarious substitution, as now argued, you hold that the whole elect Church has been aggregately justified in Christ; but how can this be made to square with the doctrine of original sin, by which it would appear that all Adam's posterity come into the world condemned in him?—that is, you virtually state, that persons can be looked upon by God as justified and condemned at the same time. To this objection I give the following answer:—

I refer to Scriptural facts on the subject. I come, for instance, to the epistle to the Ephesians, and therein I read how of that whole Church, taken in the bulk, it is affirmed by Paul, chapter i., verse 4, that it was "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world;" and yet, in chapter ii., verses 1-3, he describes them as "dead in trespasses and sins," &c., and as being "by nature the children of *wrath*, even as others." Now, here we have an example of a whole Church looked upon by God as justified and condemned at the same time. Let us take the example of Paul, who declares of himself, 1 Tim. i. 13, that he was a "blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious;" and yet, in Gal. i. 15, 16, we find him using the following words:—"When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb," &c.—that is, in the councils of heaven Paul was looked upon as justified; and yet he was allowed to go on in a reprobate career for a long period of his natural life. To the holders of the doctrine of vicarious substitution, the difficulty becomes solved at once; forasmuch as such declare that there is no personal appearance required for justification before God at all—that Christ, as the selected

H

unit, was placed upon trial for all his saved people—that he being found perfect, or, to use the expression of the apostle, having been “justified by the Spirit,” his whole elect Church, all for whom he undertook, was thus found perfect, or justified *en masse* in him; so that the personal position of such at their birth, or their after conduct in life, is not taken into any account whatsoever here. All that may be done by believers in their future life, whether such be of longer or shorter duration—all the providences, accidents, and experiences, from their very first existence in the world till they are going out of the same, have nought, in whole or in part, to say to the matter of their justification before God, if the system of doctrine which I have laid down in this work be found Scripturally correct and true. Such contingencies of our being may be permitted or designed for other purposes—namely, for our sanctification, our progress in the divine life, our advancement in the way of our moral aptitude, that not only an entrance, but an *abundant* entrance, may be administered to us, by and by, into the kingdom of everlasting life and glory. In the matter of our justification, we have nought whatsoever to do; it has, if ever, been settled for us before we were born. “For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,” &c. All responsibility is, respecting our justification, taken from us. The justification of believers is finished; the whole work was accomplished for the Church by another, even Christ, in whom it was bound up from eternity. The council of this peace was settled between the three Persons of the Godhead. Such is the answer I give to this most difficult, and involved, and, to my mind, otherwise inexplicable question. Let those who hold the commonly-received Lutheran theorem of justification by faith alone, or who, in any other way, deny the doctrine of vicari-

ous interposition, solve the difficulty as best they may.

We can, from the above line of argument, assign the reason why God deals with those whom his infinite wisdom and goodness may choose from out of mankind, from time to time, for salvation—viz., taking numbers of such during their very infancy—sanctifying others almost from their mothers' womb, allowing them the privilege of living throughout a long course of virtuous active life; whilst others, on the other hand, are permitted to go forward in a course of mad and riotous living, being made monuments of divine grace; some at an earlier age, others at a later; some saved “in extremis,” like the dying thief, in the very ribs of death—“plucked as brands from the burning;” or, as the apostle has it in 1 Cor. iii. 15, “saved, yet so as by fire.” The reason to be assigned for one and all such like, and a thousand other unnamed experiments of grace, is to be found mainly, if not entirely, in the doctrine of vicarious substitution, here by me now so strongly, so urgently, put forth—namely, that God's justice having got its full and complete vindication in what Christ did for its satisfaction, towards justifying the elect, God, humanly speaking, is now at liberty to act towards such, after any manner that he may please.

A fifth objection (and the last which I shall here mention) that shall, no doubt, be taken against my system of doctrine, as here defined, will be found in the use of the word *world*, instead of *elect*, in many of those passages of Scripture which I have quoted from time to time, as bearing me out in the line of argument, which I may have been adopting; for instance, in those texts, as—“God so loved the *world*,” &c.; “God was, in Christ, reconciling the *world* unto himself;” again, Christ being said to be “a propitiation for the sins of the whole *world*,” &c. In all which passages, the word “world” seems intentionally to be

selected. I am aware of the interpretation put upon this word by persons of the particular "redemptionist" school—namely, that the word is applied in reference to the bringing in of the Gentiles within the bounds of the Christian covenant, in opposition to the Jewish exclusionists of that day. But, however ingenious such an interpretation may seem to be, I accept it not as being altogether satisfactory to my mind; neither do I adopt still less the view of the universal redemptionists; and without binding myself to any system of universalism which I have heard propounded by any sectarists, I feel free to acknowledge that I rejoice at the extensiveness of the word "*world*," used in the above and corresponding paragraphs of the Word, and should be sorry to exchange it, if I could, for the term "*elect*," or any other one of such a narrowing and exclusive signification. What my peculiar opinion on this point is, I shall not now declare, inasmuch as it would take up far more space than what I could afford within the limitations to be given to the present volume; and to give out the expression of my opinion on such a captious question, without entering into a full and detailed argument, would but expose me to prejudice and misapprehension. However, I promise (God sparing my life to accomplish my intention) to give forth my judgment upon this most difficult and entangled subject in a future volume, wherein it shall receive at my hands the very calmest, fullest, and most prayerful consideration. All I shall say further here is, that whilst the present is expressly the age, or dispensation, of *election*—"for God is now taking out from amongst the nations a people for his name"—the next shall be the age, or dispensation, of *universalism*"—for all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest." The whole world now is said to "lie in wickedness"—that is, under the usurped domination of the wicked one, or Satan; but, then, the whole world shall lie in righteousness, or under the universal legal sway of the righteous one—that is, Christ.

There are two texts of Scripture of difficult meaning, which would seem to have light thrown upon them by some of the subjects, which have come under discussion in replying to the objections now discussed, upon which texts I would wish to make a passing comment. The first is that in 2 Cor. v. 16, in which the apostle gives utterance to the following remarkable declaration :—“Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.” Now, this saying of the apostle, in the first place, proves the correctness of what I stated concerning Christ’s atonement—namely, that no part of it really took effect whilst he was here *on earth*, else, surely, we should have our minds so far forth directed, by an apostolic injunction, towards that part so accomplished by him whilst thus *in the flesh*. Neither should the texts, as Gal. vi. 14, 1 Cor. ii. 2, be considered as bearing against the above view, since every one must acknowledge that by the strong expressions in the passages, the apostle meant, by the figure of speech, metonymy, the whole finished work of Christ’s mysterious atonement.

But, secondly, the above saying of Paul proves the doctrine that we have been contending for all along in this section to be the true one, for why, otherwise, are our minds to be directed to the position of Christ so entirely as to his resurrection state, but that the apostle saw, concentrated in Christ’s resurrection, and his consequent acceptance with his Father, the vicarious justification of all his saved people, as he states the matter expressly in Romans iv. 25—“who was delivered for *our* offences, and was raised again for *our* justification.” In all fairness of exposition we must put down the two clauses of this text in the same category of interpretation ; but all persons of the evangelical school acknowledge the *sufferings* of Christ to have been of *vicarious* import, therefore, by parity of reasoning, they should confess the *resurrection* of Christ to be of a *vicarious* import likewise.

The second text that I now wish to comment upon, as having light thrown upon it by the subjects already introduced, is, that otherwise very obscure one in John xx. 17, where Christ desires Mary not to touch him, "for," says he, "I have not yet ascended to my Father and to your Father; to my God and to your God." Evidently Mary was about to touch him—that is, to embrace Christ with something of the same feeling of tenderness, veneration, and love, with which she was wont to approach him before his crucifixion, though, of course, with much increased wonder and admiration, if not of adoration, because of his having been raised from the dead. But Christ puts her off, not wishing, according to the interpretation I have given above of the passage, that either Mary, or any other of his disciples, should know him any longer *after the flesh*. No doubt Christ would wish further to direct her mind to the great work of atonement, which he was about vicariously to enter upon, as the risen High Priest of the Church. His language would, therefore, seem to imply—"Although I have allowed my blood to be shed in the outward court of the tabernacle of this world, as the spotless lamb that was to be slain, &c., yet do not approach me with such reverence or worship, as though the work of redemption were thereby consummated by me; nay, on the contrary, I am now only about to *commence* my important undertaking, as the Saviour of the world, for I am now about to ascend, as the risen High Priest of the Church, and to enter heaven—the real Holy of Holies—to present my blood, so shed, for acceptance to "my Father and to your Father; to my God and your God." I would here note, that Christ saying thus emphatically, to "*my Father, and to your Father,*" &c., proves the *vicarious* character of his atonement within the veil, inasmuch as, whatever acceptance he knew his undertaking would have with the Father, the same acceptance, through this his finished work of righteousness and atonement, it would

have for those whom he went to represent within the veil.

Neither must we allow Christ's permitting Thomas afterwards to touch him, to interfere with the interpretation now given, for this was altogether for a different purpose, even to assure Thomas of his real personal identity, in order that this doubting disciple should no longer be found faithless, but believing.

END OF SECTION I.

SECTION II.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

FOR perspicuity sake I wish to begin this section after the same manner, in which I began the former—viz., to state the arrangement which I intend to adopt in discussing the various topics which I wish to bring before the attention of my readers.

I.—I shall give a plain statement of the leading subject intended to be treated of in the present section.

II.—I propose to give, what I consider, a fair and full analysis of that scheme, to oppose which, as being, in my judgment, unscriptural, and, therefore, untenable, I have undertaken to write the present work—namely, the Lutheran theorem of justification by “faith *only*, *without the deeds of the law*.”

III.—I shall explain my reasons for my opposition to this most long established and popular theorem.

IV.—I shall give my own view of the position which faith holds in the matter of our justification.

V.—I shall lay down seven canons of interpretation deduced from the writings of Paul, by which I shall test the correctness, or non-correctness, of the two systems to be here discussed.

VI.—I shall give four illustrations, chiefly taken from the Scriptures, for the purpose of explaining the particular view of justification by faith, which I here propose to substitute in the place of justification by faith *only*.

VII.—I shall answer some objections, which will naturally arise from the substitution of the new system here laid down.

VIII.—I shall show some of the leading benefits to be derived from the system I propose, in contradistinction to the Lutheran system, now objected against.

I.—I shall give a plain statement of the subject intended to be treated of in the present section—namely, justification by faith.

The second tribunal, at which we are to seek for justification, is that of our own consciousness and inward experience. When we seek for justification at the bar of this tribunal, we can no longer plead by *proxy*—we must take our trial at the bar of this court, according to the technical law term, *propria persona*; a *personal* appearance will be demanded of us here; we are called upon no longer to try after that mysterious search—viz., whether “our names be written in the Lamb’s book of life from the foundation of the world;” but we are called upon to make a plain and palpable search to be testified to by our own Christian experience, whether the name of Christ has been truly and effectually called upon us—viz., by our “departing from all iniquity,” or by our “following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.” We are no longer desired to examine into the archives of eternity to see whether we have “the Father’s name written in our foreheads,” but are desired to go out after that, which is far more tangible, blessed, and practical—namely, whether, through the spirit of adoption within us, we are enabled to cry unto our God, and call him by that most endearing of all appellations, even “Abba Father.” The tribunal here set up is no longer, like the former one, established in the court of heaven; but the tribunal at which we are now about to take our stand is in the court of the human heart. If we wish to plead our cause in this court, so as to obtain the

verdict of its approval, we must bring a certain number of accredited witnesses to testify in our favour. There are three leading witnesses which, it will be necessary for us, should appear in our behalf, if we are to seek for a successful issue here. The three witnesses, now referred to are, repentance, faith, and the Spirit of God. Thus, for instance, our Saviour exhorts his hearers, in Mark i. 14, “to *repent* and *believe* the Gospel;” and so Peter, in Acts ii. 38, exhorts his hearers “to *repent* and be baptized every one of them, for the remission of sins,” &c. Again: chapter iii. 19—“*Repent* ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,” &c.; and thus John, 1st Epistle v. 10—“He that *believeth* on the Son of God hath the *witness in himself*,” and, once more, that I may not be tedious in quoting too many Scriptures, Paul, in Romans viii. 16, thus testifies—“The *Spirit of God witnesseth* with our spirit, that we are the children of God.”

The phase of justification to be brought forward in the present section differs in many essential particulars from the phase of justification, as explained in the former section. The former, as we have seen, was perfectly free, gratuitous, and unconditional; the present, on the other hand, depends on the conditions of “repentance towards God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ.” The former phase of justification was perfect and complete, being centred in the finished satisfaction of Christ, or his righteousness, which can admit neither of addition nor subtraction; this latter must be, on the contrary, always imperfect and incomplete, being dependent upon each individual’s particular faith and repentance, which graces of the Spirit, even with the most advanced Christians, never reach unto perfection, but are always open to further increase and development. Again: in the former there can be no apostasy, but in the present there may and will be *many* apostasies, or fallings away and risings up again, even amongst the most favoured people of God.

In the former there are no responsibilities or accountabilities, but in the present we are responsible and accountable to God and man for the exercise of our faith and repentance—for the upholding and continuance of the same, as well as for their constant increase and advancement. The former lays the foundation for the most perfect peace and the most settled holy assurance, inasmuch as it stands upon, or is identified with, the doctrine of vicarious substitution in Christ; the latter lays no foundation for either peace or holy assurance *in itself*, excepting so far forth as it may come up *in evidence* for the apprehension of the former doctrine, as bringing such blessed results to the soul. The former may be compared to the sun, as sending forth the *originating* rays of light, for the comfort and illumination of all those who may come within the range of its influence and its power; the latter may be compared to the moon, which hath no light in itself, but shines forth merely with *borrowed* and comparatively inferior lustre. Believers' peace and assurance must ever be drawn *ab extra* from the finished work of Christ *without*, but never *ad intra* to the grace of faith *within*, however comparatively advanced and perfect such faith may be. I find the expression, "full assurance," used three times in the Scriptures. The first connected with the understanding; the second, with the grace of hope; and the third, with that of faith. (Compare Colos. ii. 2, Heb. vi. 11, and x. 22.) The Greek word is a remarkable word, and some people derive its meaning from the circumstance of a vessel, with full sail, under a favourable breeze, coming into harbour. What I mean here to assert is, that neither full assurance, nor the peace and consolation consequent upon its experience, are connected with that which takes place within the understanding, or as respects the amount of hope and faith in the believer, as they depend upon that which *alone* forms the great subject-matter, or foundation, of all such blessed experiences in the soul.

When faith—for it is with this grace we have now more particularly to do—becomes the instrument of producing peace and joy, it never rests satisfied with anything *less* than that which satisfies the divine justice. Its motto is ever “looking” (or, as the original word means, looking off from all other things) “unto Jesus.” Faith may be compared, according to the above view of it, to the telescope, which is an instrument so ingeniously constructed, as to shut out all distracting rays which might prevent the observer from having his eye completely fixed upon the one object, upon which he wished to gaze. Now, surely, the more perfect the instrument may be, as to its various lenses and all its other parts, the better for the astronomer to obtain his wished-for result; and thus the more perfect faith could be—that is, the more it would have conjoined with it all its necessary accompanying graces and virtues—when used in the work of justification, the better; whereas, keeping it distinct from all these, and making it stand alone, would it not be like, to use the above illustration, as though we, wishing to bring into the field of view one of the principal objects of the heavenly bodies, would then break up the instrument, and separate it from some of its essential parts? much less could we say that the instrument itself, however complete, could be substituted for any of the heavenly objects at which, with it, we desire to look. But is not this, or something analogous to it, what the advocates of the Lutheran system do, when they propose to make faith *alone* a formal plea for our justification?

II.—I propose to give what I consider a fair and full analysis of that scheme, to oppose which, as being, in my judgment, unscriptural, and, therefore, untenable, I have undertaken to write the present work—namely, the Lutheran theorem of justification by “*faith only, without the deeds of the law.*”

Wishing to give the advocates of the Lutheran sys-

tem the benefit of the clearest and most logically-reasoned out argument in its favour that I have met with, previously to giving the analysis spoken of above, I here make large extracts from the talented discourses of him, who is reckoned by far the ablest theological Dialectitian of the age; I mean the "ten discourses upon the nature and effects of faith," preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, by "James Thomas O'Brien, D.D., the then fellow of Trinity College, and Archbishop King's lecturer in divinity in the University of Dublin," "being an attempt to establish and explain the doctrine of justification by faith only."

These discourses were printed in the year 1833, and a second edition of them has been long since solicited at the hands of the very clever writer, (since elevated to the See of Leighlin and Ferns,) but without any effect.

I have taken the extracts from the four first sermons, as these contain his lordship's arguments in favour of the doctrine which he would wish to establish. The fifth and sixth sermons are in answer to objections to the view he advocates; but as these objections mainly bear upon the system of those who, with more or less tendency to Romanism, advocate the doctrine of justification by works, or rather would confound the Lutheran system of justification by faith only, with that of works, as such objections do not bear, in anywise, upon the doctrine which I here mainly support, I have not, therefore, taken any extract, at any length, from these discourses. The four last discourses in the volume being upon the "practical effects" of the Lutheran theorem of faith, as here set forth, I have reserved, therefore, any extracts to be taken from these for the next volume, which I propose, under Providence, to give to the public, and which is to be of a practical character.

The bishop's first discourse has for its text Acts xvi. 31, and is on the "nature of faith."

It seems written chiefly to oppose the Sandemanian error, between which and the Romish notions of faith, he holds, in his first note, that there is "a close correspondence." The bishop, by a long course of inductive argument, proves that by what he terms saving faith is meant, cordial trust in God's mercy through Jesus Christ. As, therefore, there is no controversy between us on this subject, my extracts from his first sermon may be but very short.

Page 26—"Nor will the firmest belief in the Scripture narrative, with the clearest apprehensions of the Gospel scheme, and the soundest views of Christian doctrine, constitute faith in Christ, until, to this clear conviction of the sufficiency of his atoning sacrifice be added a *real desire* for its fruits, and *heartfelt confidence* in its efficacy; until the *Spirit* has enabled us to repose in humble reliance, for time and for eternity, upon the mercy and the truth of a reconciled God."

Page 27—"True and lively faith is not only the common belief of the articles of our faith, but it is also a *true trust* and *confidence* in the mercy of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a *steadfast hope* of all good things to be received at God's hands."

"The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe that Holy Scripture and all the articles of our faith are true, but also to have a *sure trust* and *confidence* in God's merciful promises."

The bishop's second sermon is "On the source of faith, and on the repentance which is essential to true faith."

He takes his text from Heb. xi. 1—"Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

Of this he gives the following new translation:—Faith is "*a confident expectation of the things for which we hope, and a conviction of their existence, though they be not seen.*"

Respecting the difficulties which the natural man

has in the reception of true saving faith, the bishop writes as follows, at page 36:—

“Those who hold the view of the nature of faith which I have endeavoured to support, find an obvious necessity for the operation of the *Spirit of God* to produce it. To convince of sin—to awaken a lively sense of its guilt and danger—to inspire a real desire for deliverance, and prompt the repentant cry, ‘What must I do to be saved?’—and then to extinguish all self-dependence—to repress all self-righteous strivings, and effectually to teach that in *confidence and quietness is our strength*—to tranquilize the fears of the awakened sinner, by the efficacy of the atoning work of the Saviour—and, what is harder still, to cleanse his conscience and silence its reproaches by the sufficiency of the same stupendous offering for sin; all this must be done before the heart can truly feel that *confidence in God, through Christ*, which we maintain to be *saving faith*: and to effect this change in all the natural feelings of the heart, will, assuredly, by all who know the heart, be easily admitted to be the work, *not of man’s might or of his power, but of the Spirit of the Lord of Hosts.*”

Again: at page 39, he writes—“Has the desire for deliverance no difficulties to overcome before the heart *submits itself to the righteousness of God*, and trusts, not in profession, but truly, not in part, but altogether, in the blood and merits of the Redeemer? Is man’s *moral pride* an inconsiderable obstacle to this trust in another; or is it the same thing to be convinced that this pride is wrong, or injurious, or destructive even, and to cease to feel it?”

At page 40—“All who believe or understand the truth, must see that it is distinctly declared to us, that to fit those who embrace God’s offers of mercy for the blessings which he has prepared for them, it is essential that they be freed from the dominion of sin, and conformed to the image of their Redeemer; and they see too

that, in God's ordinary dealings, this change of character is effected by a course of discipline, and they learn that upon this course they are entering when they become believers in Christ. All know that his Word declares, that without taking his yoke and burden upon us, denying ourselves daily, taking up the Cross and following him; renouncing the friendship of the world, which is enmity against God; turning in heart and affections, not from its vanities and vices merely, but at his call, from its most allowed enjoyments; abandoning, at his command, everything dear to man's natural heart—wealth, and ease, and reputation—love, and friendship, and kindred affections—we *cannot* be his disciples."

Page 44—"My chief purpose was to show that what we know of the nature of our own minds furnishes a sufficient reason for what the Bible so distinctly reveals—for the necessity of the influence of *the Spirit* to effect that change of heart which ends in a joyful and humble acceptance of redemption in the way which God has appointed. I think that, for this object, what has been said is enough, if it be but fairly considered," &c.

Again: page 45—"Faith, as we have said, is trust in the Redeemer, and in his work. But that this trust be genuine, it is plainly necessary that we should feel truly our need of redemption, and truly desire it, as well as truly believe that Christ died to redeem us. Faith, then, is not the act of one careless about the interests of his immortal soul; and, therefore, consenting easily to confide anywhere or in any one, a charge in which he feels but little concern; but of one alive to the soul's infinite value, and to the momentous importance of eternity. It is not the act of one at ease about the safety of his soul, with little sense of guilt, and little fear of punishment; but of one who feels himself condemned by God's righteous law, and, by its sentence, a sinner in thought, and word, and deed; and who feels,

too, the certainty of his danger, as well as the reality of his guilt; and who seeks relief from this terror and remorse in none of those refuges of lies by which such salutary alarm is so often mitigated and finally extinguished; but who, feeling the nothingness of them all, and renouncing them all, has, under this sense of sin, and danger, and helplessness, come in sincerity to Christ for everything—for safety, and innocence, and strength. It is plain, I say, that it is idle in this case to talk of trust being reposed in the Redeemer, unless by one who feels thus that he is lost; and that he has no power in himself to help himself. A serious impression, therefore, of the importance of eternity and its interests—a real conviction of sin and of its sinfulness—a heartfelt sense of our own guilt and depravity—a heartfelt sense, too, of our helplessness, of our weakness, and our wants—must be felt by all who can be truly said to trust in Christ; as knowing in whom they trust, and knowing, also, that they are confiding to his care.” “This *part of repentance*, therefore, is implied in faith rightly understood, and is, strictly speaking, *essential* to it.”

The third sermon has, for its text, Acts xiii. 38, 39, and is “on the nature and the grounds of justification.” The following extracts I think necessary to give from this sermon. Page 60—“Having seen so much of the nature of faith, and of its source, we are now to inquire, my brethren, into what alone gives to either, all that it has beyond speculative interest for us—into its effects. And these divide themselves so easily into *effects upon our state before God*, and *effects upon our character*; and there is such an obvious convenience in employing so simple and natural a division of the subject, that, in all I shall say to you upon it, I shall endeavour to keep these two heads distinct.

“As to the first, then—the effect of faith upon our state before God—the Bible is upon it so clear and copious that I do not think it too much to say, that a

plain man, who had read no other book on the subject, would find it hard to conceive how any difficulty could have ever risen about it. It is there very expressly, and in a great variety of forms, asserted that, in the matter of justification *before God*, faith is, by his gracious appointment, *counted for obedience*; that it *restores* us to that state of *favour and acceptance* with him, in which the *perfect righteousness* of his law would have sustained us, had we been able to have attained to that righteousness, and to have preserved it."

"This fundamental doctrine of the Gospel of Christ—the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION by FAITH *only*"—page 61.

Again, at page 62—"Neglecting then, as in that case, the kindred and derived senses which, in common with every important word in every language, it has, JUSTIFICATION will, I think, be found to be, in its proper and common meaning, *a judicial declaration of the innocence of the person justified.*"

Again, in the same page—"Thus in warning against sin, God declares of himself that 'He will not *justify* the wicked;' which is explained, if it need explanation, by the corresponding declaration, that he 'will by no means *clear* the guilty.' He commands the judges of his people, who were to decide between litigants, to *justify* the righteous, and to *condemn* the wicked. He expresses abhorrence alike of those who '*justify the wicked, and condemn the just*;' and in repeating the denunciation against this unrighteous judgment, periphrases occur, for both terms, which can leave no shadow of doubt as to their meaning. 'It is not good to *accept the person* of the wicked, to overthrow the righteous in judgment.' 'He that saith unto the wicked, *Thou art righteous*, him shall the people curse; nations shall abhor him,' and 'Woe unto them . . . which justify the wicked for reward, and *take away the righteousness* of the righteous from him.' 'How,' it is elsewhere asked, 'can a man be justified with God?'"

At page 65, the Bishop says,—“It is evident, then, that in the justification with which we have to do—in which man is the party, and God the Judge—we have only to look to the law to which man is amenable, to see what his justification means—what this declaration of his innocence by his all-seeing Judge includes. And finding that that law contains clear precepts, to which exact obedience is required, no less than strict prohibitions enforced with equal vigour; finding that any failure in performing every part of all that it enjoins to be performed, as effectually overthrows innocence as the plainest commission of all that it forbids to be done, we seem warranted and obliged to conclude, that man's justification comprehends not only his *acquittal* from having *violated* the divine law, but his *acceptance* also, as having *perfectly fulfilled it*.”

At page 76 we read—“This is the mystery of redemption to which the Apostle enables us to reply—we are “*justified freely* by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.” He is the PROPITIATION through which God is just, when he justifies *the ungodly* who are found in him; *for he died for the ungodly. All have sinned, and death is the wages of sin*; but he, by the grace of God, hath tasted death for every man. And now all who are *found in him* are JUSTIFIED. God doth not impute to them *the sin* that they have *committed*, for Christ hath come to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself; they are found in him, and his blood cleanseth from all sin. God doth impute to them the *righteousness* which they *have not*; for they are found in Christ, accepted in the beloved, not having their own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God.”

Sermon the 4th is on “The connexion between Faith and Justification.” The text is Rom. iii. 38, which the Bishop lays so much stress upon as to make it the text of two other sermons besides—“Therefore

we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." "Hear, however, another brief statement, containing a comprehensive, exact, and even a minute account of the whole proceeding—'Now unto him that worketh is the reward reckoned, not of grace, but of debt; but unto him that worketh not, but believeth upon him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted unto him for righteousness.' This is language which I should feel myself idly employed in endeavouring to explain. It might be possible, doubtless, for human ingenuity to devise some form of expression more entirely free from ambiguity, but it would not, I think, be easy, and I am sure it could answer no useful end. I am sure that if any one now desired to convey the information, that it is the *ungodly* whom God justifies—those who have violated his law, not those who have obeyed it; and that this *mode* of proceeding is to *count the faith which they have for the righteousness which they have not*; and if for this purpose the language of the Apostle occurred to him, 'But unto him that worketh not, but believeth upon him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness.'—I am sure, I say, that such a one would never reject this statement, or add to it, or abridge it, or in any respect alter it, under an apprehension that his meaning could be mistaken by any fair mind. And to attempt anything beyond this by any statement, seems vain. To set about fabricating forms of expression that shall baffle the pernicious ingenuity with which we contrive to evade the natural force of plain language, when it conveys to us what we do not like to hear, betrays an ignorance alike of the imperfections of human language, and of the wiles of the human heart." (Pages 91 and 92.)

And again:—"Thus, explaining how the Gospel shews forth *the righteousness of God without the law*, he stops to mark the way in which that righteousness

is communicated, 'even the righteousness of God which is *by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all, and upon all them that believe.' For the manifestation of this righteousness, Christ is set forth by God, he tells us, as a propitiation, but it is, he fails not to notice, a *propitiation, through faith, in his blood*; and while he refers to this glorious offering as establishing the justice of God in *freely* justifying sinners, he takes occasion to specify who are the sinners that are the objects of this free pardon. "To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him *which believeth in Jesus*.' Is he magnifying God's *free grace*? He finds room to notice how it operates:—"By grace are ye saved, *through faith*." Or commemorating his *eternal purposes in Christ concerning his Church*, the very name of the Redeemer forces him, as it were, to glance at the benefits which we owe to him, and at the way in which they have been secured to us: 'According to the *eternal purpose* which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord; in whom we have boldness and access with confidence, *by the faith of him*.'" (Pages 93, 94.)

And again:—"In reasoning on the subject, he always treats this method of justifying sinners by faith as a scheme of free forgiveness. *They are justified by his grace—justified freely by his grace*; indeed he distinctly intimates, that a reason, at least, for appointing *faith* to be the channel of communicating the promised blessings, was in order that they might be *gratuitous*: "Therefore it is *of faith*, that it might be *by grace*.'" (Page 95.)

And again:—"That this was no new method of dealing with man, he proves by the record of God's justification of him from whom the Jews derived all their privileges. He dwells upon the case of Abraham, and recurs to it as exhibiting most strikingly that justification by faith which was the great subject of his own preaching. No one who reads his account

of God's proceeding with Abraham *fairly*, can doubt what is *meant by his faith*. He is described as against hope believing in hope, that he might be the father of many nations; as being not weak in faith, nor moved by any of the circumstances which rendered the fulfilment of God's promise so improbable; as not staggering at the promise of God through unbelief; strong in faith, giving the glory to God, and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised he was also able to perform. And after thus establishing the nature of Abraham's faith, by shewing the reality and the strength of his trust in God's promises, the Apostle adds, '*And therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness.*' And then he goes on to tell us, that the record of this act, and of the mode of it, which the Old Testament contains, was designed to insure to all Abraham's true children, all who share in his faith, that they shall also share in his justification: 'Now it was not written for his sake only that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe in him who raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead.'" (Pages 97, 98.)

The next and last quotation from the bishop's work, is from his sixth Sermon, pp. 161-163:—"Thus as to the two first difficulties—what I said of the part which faith really performs in a sinner's justification, (in reply to the question—What is the peculiar *excellence* of faith?) rightly considered, will be seen to afford materials for a satisfactory answer to both. I showed you, then, that when believers are justified by faith, their faith being counted for righteousness, their faith does not justify them as a part, small or great, of their righteousness; but as the appointed means of uniting them to him, who has chosen as the name whereby he is to be called, the Lord our Righteousness: and that this is a fit appointment, even according to what we can see of it; for that if we are to be justified altogether by *another's* merits,

and not in any degree by *our own cordial trust* in that Being, and at a hearty renunciation of all trust in ourselves, would seem to be the precise state of mind to which an efficacious interest in those merits ought to be annexed. Now, whether this be an *act of the mind* or not, would not seem of much importance, so long as it is so clearly distinguished from *all other acts*, and so clearly fitted for its place in the *free justification of sinners*. But the truth is, that in all that St. Paul says to exclude *works* from a share in our justification, it is plain that he does not speak of *works in general*, but those works which, *being enjoined by law*, have a natural tendency to justify man—works in obedience to the known will of God.

“No one who reads what he has written on this subject with any tolerable candour, can imagine that he had in view a distinction so little to his purpose as one between *active* and *passive* states of mind or body. He seems not to have imagined, that by such miserable refinements a question could be raised, as to whether believers receive justification *freely* when they receive it by their *faith*; and he leaves that matter to the common sense and natural feelings of those to whom he wrote, without engaging their attention, or his own, in such *artificial* difficulties. God had established a particular covenant with the Jewish people by express revelation, and a more general one with the whole human race, by bestowing upon all a nature capable of appreciating the moral differences of actions—a faculty which, anticipating or expressing his righteous judgment, approves or disapproves of human conduct. Under both covenants there was the notion of duty and sin, of reward and punishment, of merit and demerit; but under neither could *faith pretend to merit or claim reward*. Neither from the constitution of human nature, nor from the provisions of God’s express law, could those be re-

garded as meritorious who confessedly had failed to perform their duty, and who confessedly had incurred the penalties of law. Their trust in the obedience of another, and in the sufferings of another, might become by another revelation at once a clear duty, and effectual means of deliverance; but that even then this acknowledgment, which adds to an abjuration of *all merit in ourselves*, an ascription of *all merit to another*, left a *reserve* of some merit to acknowledgment itself, seems never to have crossed the Apostle's mind. He seems satisfied that all who know either the Jewish law, or the law of nature, would see that God, in *annexing justification to faith*, was justifying *gratuitously*; that he was not *paying wages*, but *making a free donation*. This is enough for his purpose; and this is surely equally true, whether faith be or be not an act of the mind—a question with which he seems never to have been disturbed; nor need we. It belongs to metaphysicians, and may be safely left to them. They will, probably, continue to determine that it is a complete act of the mind; but for St. Paul's purpose, it is plainly a matter of *perfect indifference* how they shall determine."

From the above extracts, as well as from others to be taken from writers advocating the same system, I present the following, as a fair analysis or abstract of the Lutheran theorem of the doctrine of justification by faith only, and against each and all of the propositions now about here to be set forth, I enter my most earnest and solemn protest, as running counter to the testimony and verdict of the written Word of God.

First,—It is maintained by the advocates of the above system, that faith is the *formal plea* or cause of the sinner's justification before God; and in support of this proposition, the Bishop puts forth the following most unscriptural and most surprising tenet:—"It is," he says, "very expressly, and in a great variety

of forms asserted, that in the matter of justification before God, faith is by his gracious appointment, counted for obedience; that it restores us to that state of favour and acceptance with him, in which the perfect righteousness of his law would have sustained us, had we been able to have attained to that righteousness, and to have preserved it." (Page 60.)

Secondly,—In order to uphold the above proposition, the advocates of the Lutheran theorem of justification have arbitrarily invented a distinction between what they technically denominate—"fides *sola*, and fides *solitaria*," by which distinction they would imply, that though faith, where true and saving, as they call it, hath certain graces, as repentance, hope, love, &c., always enjoined with it, so as that it never should be looked upon as *solitaria* or *solitary*, that is, standing *alone* without any virtue or grace annexed to it; yet in the matter of justification, it is to be fides *sola*, or faith *without* any of those, its sanctifying effects, united with it; or to quote the language of the Homily on this point, "that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it *shutteth them out from the office of justifying*."

Thirdly,—In order to uphold the Lutheran theorem, its advocates have introduced, of their own accord, and *without any sanction from the Word of God*, the term faith *alone*, or faith *only*.

Fourthly,—They interpret the expression "*deeds of the law*," as synonymous with the "*fruits of faith*."

Fifthly,—They make the sinner's justification before God to depend on the *conditions of faith and repentance*, and of which conditions they give the following definitions. First, They define faith to mean trust; yea, cordial, heart-felt trust or confidence in the mercy of God in Christ, and that most properly according to the declaration of the Apostle in Rom. x. 11, viz., "It is with the *heart* man believeth unto righteous-

ness." So far respecting faith, as a condition for justification. And secondly, as regards repentance, they take as much of it as is essential to render *faith real*. Take, for instance, the following declaration:—"It is plain, I say, that it is idle to talk of trust being reposed in the Redeemer, unless he feels that he is lost, and that he has no power of himself to help himself. A serious impression, therefore, of the importance of eternity and its interests—a real conviction of sin, and of its exceeding sinfulness—a heartfelt sense of our own guilt and depravity—a heartfelt sense, too, of our helplessness, of our weakness, and of our wants—must be felt by all who can be truly said to trust in Christ, as knowing in whom they trust, and knowing also what they are confiding to his care."—Page 45.

Sixthly,—They define justification to be the "*judicial declaration of the innocence of the person justified*;" and moreover, they use the term innocence in a way different from what the word implies in the courts of human judicature, where it is used merely in a *negative* sense, namely, as "*abstaining from the prohibitory injunction of law*"; whereas, as the word is included in man's justification, it involves in its meaning not only negatively his acquittal from having violated the divine law, but *positively* his *acceptance* also, as having *perfectly* fulfilled it; and therefore, as being the fulfilment of a law at once not only prohibitory, but mandatory, it embraces in its results both immunity from punishment, and the promise of reward."

Seventhly, and lastly,—In stating the grounds of the justification of sinners, they declare them to be justified not only by the vicarious sufferings of Christ, but by his righteousness *imputed* to them *by faith* also. See page 77. The following are the words of the Bishop here:—"Now all who are found in Christ are justified. God *doth not impute* to them *the sin* that

they have committed; for Christ hath come to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself; they are found in him, and his blood cleanseth from all sin. God doth *impute* to them a *righteousness* which *they have not*, for they are found in Christ, accepted in the beloved, not having their own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God." However, a guard or caution is made against the above language, viz., that no formal division of the Redeemer's reconciling work into sufferings and obedience, is designed hereby, as though one kind of efficacy was strictly to be ascribed to the one part, and another kind to the other. The scheme rightly understood, requires no such *artificial division*, though for distinctness sake, &c., language which may seem to countenance such views, must, on account of the limited range of our faculties, oft-times be so used.

Such, then, would appear to be a fair, though brief, analysis of the Lutheran scheme of justification by faith *only, without the deeds of the law*; or, in other words, such would appear to be the several propositions into which the above tenet might allow itself to be broken down—a scheme, I am bold here to affirm, however supported by great names, justly venerated otherwise for the deepest learning, piety, and zeal, and however universally received and adopted, yet hath no support or warranty in the Word of God—a scheme that has been invented by man, in order to support him in those views of an Arminian leaven of legalism and self-righteousness, so deeply and so inveterately ingrained on man's fallen moral constitution—a scheme invented, therefore, to prevent proud man from lying completely in the dust before God, or rather to supersede the necessity of his *non-appearance* for justification *before God*, and not compelling him to plead by the *vicarious* righteousness of Christ, seeking mercy at Jehovah's hands, through the doctrine of substitution alone.

III.—But it will be more satisfactory to my readers to come at once from such general declamations against the theorem here opposed by me, to the exact statement of my particular arguments and objections against it. I shall state these now, without further preface, after a *general* and a *particular* manner.

First, then, after a *general* manner, I would state, that my objections against the universal and popular theorem of justification by *faith alone, without the deeds of the law*, must be found in my arguments already laid down in the first section of this work, in favour of the opposite and contradictory doctrine of the *vicarious* justification in Christ of sinners; and to these arguments I must now refer back my readers, merely once more declaring, that the two systems cannot be regarded as running together in parallel columns, but must be regarded, on the other hand, as completely at variance one with the other; they cannot be made to coalesce—they cannot be brought into harmony and union together; but I most unhesitatingly affirm, that if the Lutheran system of justification by *faith only* be found to be true, then the system advocated by me, of *vicarious* substitution in Christ, must be found to be false; or, in other terms, if justification *by grace* be the doctrine of the Scriptures, then justification *by faith*, as explained by Lutheran divines—viz., making faith to be the *formal plea*, &c., for justification—cannot be the doctrine of the Scriptures. This I acknowledge to be a most weighty and momentous declaration put forth, and one, therefore, that I should be sorry to make, without all due and prayerful thoughtfulness on the matter. I, therefore, give it forth for my readers' most solemn and deep investigation, leaving with them this parting warning, that whilst, in every point, truth, even the pure and undefiled truth of the Word of God, must be held with the most unswerving and tenacious hold, so more especially on a point which involves so much of very life and death in its consequences, should

we be most careful to hold to the truth, and *nothing* but the truth. There must be no compromising here—no divided allegiance—no half measures—no parleying, or shaking of hands together—no standing upon the *etiquette of compliment in subserviency to great names*, and no halting between two opinions; but, in the language of inspiration, we must say, “let God be true, though every man be found a liar.”

Such after a general manner, but now, secondly, after a *particular* manner, I shall take the above seven propositions, and bring my arguments to bear against each of them in due succession.

First, as to faith being made a *formal plea* for the sinner's justification *before God*, or, as the bishop states it, (page 143,) “that faith, by God's gracious appointment, is counted for obedience; that it restores us to the state of favour and acceptance,” &c. Although he says that in the Bible this statement is very expressly and in a great variety of forms asserted, still he has not given us any of those places in the Bible. However, I deduce from his general reasoning afterwards on the subject, that he means that his view is borne out—*e.g.*, by Romans iii. 28, and iv. 3; but, in reply to any Scriptural warranty from such texts, I must refer him, in the first place, to my paraphrase of the whole paragraph of Romans* iii. 19-28, as given in note G. And as for Romans iv. 3, this shall be taken notice of, in due course, by and by, when I hope to show that there is no foundation for the support of his assertions in this passage of the Word, no more than in that of the paragraph here named.

Leaving, therefore, for a time, the consideration of the Scriptural refutation of this the first proposition, into which the text has been broken down, let us look at the question after a more abstract and popular way; and thus I would leave it to every unpreju-

* Note G.

diced reader to discover how, after any fair consistency or manner of results, as things take place amongst ourselves, any system that would put faith into the position, which hath here been assigned to it, can be the proper or right view of the subject. For what is the position here assigned to it? If words mean anything, most certainly the bishop's words would go to make faith stand as a substitute for Christ's finished work in the matter of the sinner's justification—that is, faith is made to assume the place of an *usurper*; and so, like all persons amongst ourselves, who would protrude themselves into the seat of authority assigned to another, they, according to the dictates of human nature, will take care to put themselves so forward, during the period of such usurpation, as to set the right owner of the seat of pre-eminence as much as possible in the back ground. And so, we would ask the question, has not faith been doing this, ever since the Lutheran theorem has been allowed its prominent and usurped position amongst us? Not only by having that position *ex-cathedra*, or authoritatively, continually sounding in our ears, that justification by faith *alone*, &c., is the “doctrine of a standing or falling Church;” that it is so great a truth, “that if this truth be lost, *all Gospel is lost* ;” but, moreover, also, do we not hear this doctrine being preached, *ad nauseam*, as I would say, or reiteratedly from a thousand pulpits, whilst, where is the pulpit used even by evangelical preachers, from which you hear the strong and straightforward—the bold, the masculine, and uncompromising doctrine of *grace*, even that of the *federal headship* of Christ, or the *vicarious* justification in him of sinners, in so many plain and palpable words set forth? Has not faith, amongst us, assumed all this prominency and influence, so that you will hear justification by *faith* preached an hundred times, for once that you hear a sermon replete with justification *by Christ*, and so you will find congregations going away satisfied with them-

selves and their preachers, declaring that such a discourse to-day was so *faithful* ! and so it may be said, in a certain restricted sense, to have been, indeed, *faithful*, inasmuch as it was *full of faith*, but not full of *Christ* ; or if Christ was introduced, it was only in the way of a passing ceremonial, such as, for instance, when a servant, with fine livery, may be seen coming through a side-door, and passing, momentarily, across the stage, but never allowed to take a prominent part in the piece that is being acted. The Luthrean theorem of *justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law*, comes very near, to be sure, in sound, to the Scriptural proposition of Paul, (Romans iii. 28,) “ Therefore, we conclude, a man is *justified by faith, without the deeds of the law* ;” but on this very account it is the more dangerous, as being the more specious, and the more disguised ; and that, again, as respects a truth of no secondary or third-rate importance, but one, on the other hand, of the very first and most vital interest ; and one, therefore, that we should be most cautious not to have the very least alloy of error mixed up with. Just as, the more valuable the current coin of the realm may be, the more cautious should be the guardians of the mint to have such, made of the very purest gold, without the least alloy or dross ; and so should we (forasmuch as. the more precious the coin, the more ingenious the counterfeits will be) guard, with the greatest watchfulness and care, against any imposition.

But again : if we make faith to be the *formal plea*—if it is “ to be *counted for obedience*, or to restore us to that state of *favour and acceptance with God*,” &c.—how, I should be glad to know, can we keep man free from *boasting of*, or *glorying in his faith* ? It is to no purpose here that we try to guard against such a fearful consequence, by such declarations as the following—viz., that if it be asked—“ What is the peculiar excellence of faith that secures to it this pre-eminence over the other

graces of the believer, of being, to the exclusion of all of them, the instrument of his justification, &c. ? that if by *peculiar excellence* be meant *peculiar merit*, virtue, or deserving, faith has *none*, &c. ; but if by peculiar excellence be meant peculiar *fitness* for its office, then, I think, we can see, in faith—what, no doubt, is in it, whether we see it or not—a fitness for this its office of justifying the believer, which belongs to no other part of his character.” (See page 105.) Persons may say that faith is the *gift* of God, and, therefore, on this account, it may exclude all boasting; but the same may be said of any, or all the graces of the Spirit; and yet all such are excluded from justification by the upholders of the above system, as being works, and, therefore, interfering with the doctrine of grace.

Neither, again, will the distinction hold good which is endeavoured to be made, as though faith was not truly *a work*, inasmuch as, when we are called to *believe*, we are called to do an act which is different from any other of the prohibitory, or mandatory obligations of *law*. Nor, again, will it answer to say, that faith is the most *humble* of all graces, and more especially in the act of justification, as they say it is so much engaged with the great subject-matter of its contemplation, as to forget itself altogether; like a man, if such could be, that being placed within the body of the sun, should be so surrounded with the halo of its glory, that the glory itself, and not the individual, should be seen. Nay, let faith clothe itself ever so much in the garb of humility, yet, such is the perverse and radical corruption of our fallen nature, that it cannot be so mantled all over, as not to show, betimes, the *cloven foot of pride*. There is such a thing to be heard of as the *pride of humility*. Hence, God knowing what was in man—knowing his tendency to self-esteem, to self-preference, and presumption, &c., not wishing to leave him any room for the putting forth of such principles, or for

K

aught of the indulgence of Pharisaism whatsoever, determined to remove man out of the way in the matter of his primary justification before him—to make him plead for it in the person of another—even in him who, by his *vicarious* satisfaction to infinite justice, “finished sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness” for his redeemed people.

But, once more, and lastly: were faith to hold the distinguished position which the bishop, by his most singular declaration and testimony in its favour, would assign to it, where then would go the preference given by Paul to charity or love above all the other graces of the Spirit? and, must not, then, on the other hand, faith, according to the position assigned to it by the bishop, go far, in towering estimation, beyond hope or charity, or anything else that could be mentioned; for taking thus the place of Christ himself, or standing for him in the believer’s view, then as Christ and his righteousness exceed all things that can be mentioned, so the same can be predicated of faith, his substitute.

As to the second proposition, into which I broke down the Lutheran scheme of justification by faith alone, and according to which its advocates would try to make a distinction between faith in the act of justifying, from that which they maintain it to be, when not so used, even that it stands then for the *complex of Christianity*—like the good tree having the golden fruit of all *practical* holiness hanging pendent, on all sides, from its branches—this is to reduce the mind to the adoption of a *metaphysical* process, and that *continually*, for which it hath no inclination or power. For how, I would ask, if such a process were necessary, how could it be accomplished? For as there exists a strong analogy between the natural and spiritual existence, so I would ask a person to try the experiment, and make life so to stand alone in the mind, as to be divested of all its attributes and concomitants—such as, *e.g.*, breathing, pulsation, and anything of motion or

animation whatsoever; and if he find it hard thus to come up practically to such metaphysics, as touching natural existence, how much less can he accomplish such, as touching spiritual existence?

But suppose he were able to reach to this mode and power of continually abstracting faith, so as to keep it *alone*, or separate from all its accompanying virtues of repentance, holy fear, and love, &c., what would the use of all this nice mental process be, but (according to the testimony of James) to come up before us in the shape or appearance of a *dead* faith; for as he, speaking by the Spirit of God, declared that "as the body, without the spirit, is dead, so *faith, without works, is dead also*"—that is, the advocates of the system would bring us to the conclusion, that we are to seek to be justified before God by a *dead*, and not by a *living* faith. For, however living and effectual for all holy deeds, faith may be *previously* in the believer's walk, and conversation, and general experience, yet when he is to *think of being justified before God*, and having thereby, as the consequence of such sense of justification, all peace and joy in believing, he must, mentally at least, be committing an act of *felo de se*, or being guilty of spiritual suicide upon his *faith*; or, in other words, must render his faith (however lately and powerfully *alive*) now, at least for the time being, a *dead* faith, inasmuch as he is now called upon to separate it altogether from its works. To quote the language of the Homily—"And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified, but it *shutteth them out from the office of justifying*." As for the difference between "*fides sola*" and "*fides solitaria*," I think it is a distinction *without a difference*. I can well understand the application of the old proverb—"Never less alone than when alone"—to the experience of the real Christian, forasmuch as it means, that in *his solitude from the world* he can

have his mind feasted with *communion with his God*, &c. ; but how faith can be said to be *alone*—that is, separated from all the acts of spiritual life, or the fruits of faith—and yet not to be *solitary*, I acknowledge is a difficulty beyond my power of mind to solve.

3. As to the third proposition stated above, and in which so much stress is laid on the word *only*, as to cause it to be written, not merely in *italics*, but with *large and capital letters*, and which seems to be the very pivot, therefore, upon which the controversy now proposed to the reader's attention turns, I might think it quite sufficient to say that it is one of *complete human invention*, not found in the original passage, Rom. iii. 28, with which its originators would wish to make their followers to believe it to be united, and which, though it may appear to be but an *insignificant* word in itself to introduce, still changes the whole genius and meaning of the argument of the apostle ; and this more especially, if we take in connexion with it that which formed the fourth proposition, into which we broke up the Lutheran tenet—namely, that of interpreting the expression, "*deeds of the law*," as synonymous with "*the fruits of faith*." And here, before I proceed further with my objection against the introduction of the word *only*, I would wish to state, that the expression, the "*deeds of the law*," cannot be made a synonym with "*the fruits of faith*." The first time the remarkable expression, "*deeds of the law*," meets us is in the twentieth verse of Rom. iii. ; and, therefore, whatever meaning it has in this verse, of course, by all fair mode of exposition, it must hold in the twenty-eighth verse. But in the twentieth verse it *cannot* mean "*fruits of faith*," inasmuch as the expression is used with regard to persons who were not at all under the operation of faith—namely, with regard to the *Gentiles*, who were only under the law of nature, (see Rom. ii. 12-15,) and with regard to the *legalizing Jews*, who were seeking justification by obe-

dience to the ceremonial, if not to the moral precepts, of the law of Moses, and who were not in the exercise of faith also. But on this subject I refer my readers to my paraphrase of this whole context, as given in note G. And so having got rid of both these terms—the one as being altogether of *human invention*, and the other as being applied contrary to the *infallible interpretation of the Spirit*—it might seem as though enough were done to upset, from its very foundation, the whole Lutheran scheme of interpretation, regarding the doctrine of justification, forasmuch as these form the two chief stones upon which the whole structure has been raised, and which, if you dislodge or remove out of their position, the whole must soon crumble to pieces, and come to nought. Hence I find that I am not wrong in this my declaration. That I be not too hasty in reaching to such conclusion, it might seem to be quite enough to state one fact, even that the bishop has, in the very first words of his title-page to his remarkable discourses on the “nature and effects of faith,” the following emphatic sentence:—“An attempt to explain and establish the doctrine of justification by *faith only*.”

5. And now, as to the fifth proposition—viz., that which requires faith and repentance as *conditions of justification*; and yet, how the advocates of the system do attempt to say that, notwithstanding such shackling terms of requirements, they still hold out an offer of *free* justification to sinners, is, I acknowledge, to my mind, perfectly surprising and inconclusive; more especially, if we take into consideration what kind of faith they deem necessary for such purpose, and of repentance, so far as is essential to make faith real, as already given in the extracts adduced from the bishop's work above (see page 46.) I am aware how strongly he argues concerning the *perfect freeness* of the Gospel plan of salvation upon his own system, notwithstanding the clogging conditions required above—(see pages

95 and 109.) But although he brings here to bear, all the force of his great dialectic powers, yet all the ingenuity of his varied sophism will not prevent any careful reader of his volume from discovering the fallacy of his conclusions on the matter ; for, first, such must see at once how many *texts*, which he quotes from the apostle's writings to bear him out in his view, are texts which are altogether *forced* out of their proper *contextual bearing* ; (as I shall show, by and by, in my further discussion of this most momentous and vital truth ;) and, secondly, he must see, that the illustrations which he brings to bear him out, will, when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, prove utterly useless to him, if not altogether irrelevant to the subject. Take, for instance, the following passage as an example (p. 107) :—“ Among the various devices of human folly and pride, for making void the Cross of Christ, this strange one has certainly a place. But is this any objection to what has been stated? A drowning man rescued from destruction by the heroic self-devotion of a friend, may claim a part of the merit of his own preservation, because he clung to the hand of his preserver. One restored from a deadly distemper by the benevolence and skill of another, may urge, in abatement of the claims upon his gratitude, that had he obstinately rejected the remedies provided for him, no benevolence or skill could have availed for his recovery.”

Now, as Solomon says—“ The beginning of sin is like the letting out of water ;” so the error into which the bishop and the advocates of the Lutheran system in general have been led, with regard to their scheme of justification, has arisen out of their virtual, practical denial of the nature of the *vicarious* fall of mankind in Adam, and the *total* and *radical* corruption of human nature, as consequent thereon ; which doctrine, if the bishop had but allowed his mind to view in its full extent of utter and complete hopelessness and *helplessness*, he would be brought at once to see the fallacy of

the illustrations here used; forasmuch as the doctrine of the Scriptures here is not that of a *drowning man*, or of a *sick man*, but actually of those who are said to be already "*dead in trespasses and sins*;" but if you throw out a rope to the *dead corpse* going down the stream, or send for a physician, however skilful, to a man from whom all *animation has departed*, we need not stop to argue how different the whole view of the illustration here brought forward to support his argument must appear.

6 and 7. As I brought in the third and fourth propositions under the same head for examination; so, for brevity sake, I wish to bring the sixth and seventh propositions together after the same manner also. The sixth contains the bishop's definition of justification—namely, "*that it is a judicial declaration of the innocence of the person justified*;" and the seventh states the grounds of the sinner's justification to be in "*the vicarious sufferings of Christ and his righteousness, imputed to him by faith*." Now, against both these propositions I take exceptions upon the following grounds:—If we come to pages 62 and 63, we find the bishop making several quotations from the books of Moses, Proverbs, Psalms, &c., by which he would make appear, that to "*justify the wicked*," and to "*condemn the just*," is a matter of just abhorrence in the sight of the Holy God; and yet, with great inconsistency, he would represent God as doing that in the case of the justified sinner, for the doing of which, he threatens vengeance against any human judge. For, if we weigh his lordship's definition, as above given, is not this the very thing that he would make God to do?—viz., in making him declare, as innocent, by his arbitrary fiat, persons in themselves, completely guilty, by merely *imputing* to them an *external* righteousness. And, secondly, how is it that he makes God to be able to act thus, with any *apparent* harmony, with his justice and his holiness? But supposing that God, as

a man, could submit to an imposition to be pawned upon him, such as a very sagacious and deeply discerning sovereign might not permit to be played upon himself, without detecting the barefaced usurper, and suffering him, therefore, to undergo the immediate vengeance of his insulted majesty. For, let us suppose, on some day, when majesty allows itself to have the respect due to it, to be paid by his privileged liege subjects—suppose I say, that on this, the day of levee, some beggar from the streets, with his soiled and tattered, sordid garments upon him, would force himself thus into the presence of his sovereign, merely because he had some *outward* borrowed robe of state upon him, how would the presumption of such an affront be resented, not only by him who sat upon the throne, but by the whole court around? But what is all this but a fair illustration of the system of those who advocate the doctrine of imputed righteousness upon the Lutheran ground of justification, now so popularly and universally preached? For, surely, surely, the above parable applies, but too closely, to all sinners who, being clothed in the filthy rags of natural human depravity, would thus presume to stand before that God who can search out the very reins and thoughts of the heart, who cannot bear to look upon iniquity, and before whom the very heavens are unclean, &c., merely because they say they have *Christ's outward robe of righteousness thrown around them*, as though his all-searching eye could not then, and therefore, detect such presuming imposition, and subject it at once to the fiat of his righteous vengeance and indignation. It will be then asked of me that, denying the doctrine of imputed righteousness upon the common and general ground of its acception, what meaning can I put upon words so expressly and so seemingly beyond all power of controversy and refutation, given in the Scriptures, upon this point? My answer is, first—that though several Scriptures, which

would seem to use the illustration above—namely, such as that in Ephes. iv. 24, Colos. iii. 12, &c., refer to the believer's work of *sanctification*, as to be carried on *within* him by the operation of God's Holy Spirit, and not to the work of their *justification before God*. In proof of which, let one argument suffice, especially as the subject of the believer's sanctification, is one which belongs more immediately to the next volume, which I propose to give, under God's blessing, to the public, and in which such texts shall meet their very fullest vindication; the one argument I give is, that the Epistles are addressed, not to persons who are to seek their justification before God, but to those who are *already justified*, and who, therefore, do not require the righteousness as a robe to be put upon them, as in the passages above referred to—Ephes, iv. 24, Colos. iii. 12, &c.; therefore, the putting on the Lord Jesus, according to these texts, must be applied to the work of their sanctification, and not to that of their justification before God; the latter being a thing already accomplished, according to our argument. But there is another text which, on account of its wrong application to the doctrine of justification, I think it necessary to notice before I pass on; it is that in Revelation vii. 14, where the question having been put as to "who these were that were arrayed in white robes?" the answer is given, that "they became white by being washed in the blood of the Lamb." Now, for the reason assigned above, I must content myself with one brief declaration—namely, that if we take the infallible guidance of the Spirit of God as our expositor of this expression, we must come to the conclusion, that the verse refers to the work of inward sanctification in the believer's heart, and outward Christian experience, and not the work of his justification as a sinner before God. For, taking up the canon of interpretation laid down for general use by the apostles, and comparing spiritual things with

spiritual, we must find a verdict in favour of the view now given, to be the truth; for, if we turn to the 19th chapter of the book of Revelation, and at the 7th and 8th verses, we find that the raiment in which the Lamb's wife is being clothed, to render her fit for this most glorious of all ceremonials, is said to be "fine linen, clean and white;" and the fine linen is there declared to be "*the righteousness of the saints*," even that righteousness which is spoken of in Romans viii. 4, as the very consummation of the love of God in giving his Son for the redemption of us sinners; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, (and not for us, as—*e.g.*, by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us,) "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" and which righteousness shall receive its very highest perfection, when we, believers, having left behind us all that was of the flesh in the grave, shall come forth with "that which was born of God" within us, and which, therefore, "could never sin," to "be presented faultless before the presence of God's glory," by the great spiritual Bridegroom, who so "loved his Church, that he gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." Such, then, is the fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints, in which the spiritual bride—even the Church of the present dispensation—arrays herself, and makes her ready.

But secondly, we want not the sword of Alexander to cut the Gordian knot of this dogma of imputed righteousness; for taking with us the sword of the Spirit, we find no complication of argument here whatsoever. The doctrine of the sinner's *vicarious* justification in Christ, comes up at once to our rescue here, and dissolves all difficulty and complexity in the matter. All thus becomes at once easy, plain,

and solid. There is no imposition that needs to be practised, but all is open, honest, and above-board. The doctrine of spiritual *unitism* in Christ, sets the matter at rest once and for ever. This gives a power and solidity to the truth, such as makes it worthy of God to offer, and adequate to the sinner's wants to receive. God having *tried or tested his whole Church in Christ, as the spiritual unit*—as the one moral representative of his redeemed people—Christ stood the test so perfectly, so holily, so sinlessly—He so honoured the demands of the law, both actively and passively—He so satisfied the requirements of infinite justice, that, in the language of the prophet, “He finished sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness.” Hence he is called for his believing people, “the Lord our righteousness.” Here, then, we have substance, here we have something for the hand of faith with tenacious hold to grasp at. For as the Apostle John states in 1 Epistle iv. 17, “That as *Christ is, so are we in this world.*” And therefore, as Christ has not his righteousness by *imputation*, or as an *external garment* thrown over him, but had it inwardly as well as outwardly—in the heart and reins, even as in the sight of Him “who searcheth out the heart and reins,”—as he had it not merely in name and profession—not artificially, or, so to speak, shining forth in borrowed lustre—the possession of another, and not its own—a superficies merely reckoned to him, or put down to his account; but it is a righteousness completely and solely his own—of his own working out—a superhuman, divine, and an abiding righteousness, even the righteousness of God; so the *Church, the whole body* of believers in every age, *past, present, and to come*, having been bound up in federal or covenanted relation with him from eternity, (even as Levi was said to have been bound up in the loins of his father Abraham, or as all mankind had been bound up for sin and condemnation in Adam,) have every

thing in Christ, which he officially undertook and performed for it; and therefore, as Christ has all the righteousness, which we have here spoken of as being so perfect, so solid, so everlasting, &c., in his public character, not *for himself*, not abstractedly *as God*, but in his human nature, as “God manifested in the flesh,” so he has it all *officially*, and therefore for his Church.

I shall conclude by borrowing the words of the celebrated Hooker, so far as I can bring them in to suit the doctrine here advocated; for I am sorry to say, I cannot enlist him as being on my side in this discussion:—“Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in him, &c. . . . God beholdeth with a gracious eye such as are found in Christ, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it, and *accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous*, as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law; shall I say *more perfectly* righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say; nevertheless the apostle saith, ‘God made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.’ Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the *very Son of God himself*. Let it be counted folly, or frenzy, or fury whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered; that God hath made himself *the sin of man*, and that men are made the *righteousness of God*.”

Just like one of those modern warrior monarchs, who send forth, according to their arbitrary dictum, a certain ukase or edict of conscription, by which a number of young men are, contrary to their own will, being torn not only from their close relationships, but moreover, also from those employments for which,

by early education and training, as well as by natural qualifications, they were particularly fitted, and are forced to get into a new and unsuitable service, for which, being drilled under most strict discipline and adjutancy, they are brought forth in a new dress, gait, and general appearance, so as scarcely to be recognisable by their very nearest kindred; or, as the saying goes, they can scarce know themselves. And moreover, in this their new position, they act and move about more like automatons and machines, than free and voluntary agents. So after something of the same manner, to speak in the language of similitude, are many of the Scriptures forced from their proper and naturally CONTEXTUAL bearings and position, by the advocates of the many false systems of theology; and under a certain artificial training and discipline, are made to subserve in the ranks of some new order and uncongenial system, for which they never were originally designed or adapted; and therefore, notwithstanding all the skill, and talent, and ingenuity, which may be used to bring them to suit the service and regime, still do those texts seem to hold a position at once awkward and strait-laced, and altogether out of place.

But as regards the highly-respected and Christian bishop, from whose writings I have here taken the liberty of selecting so many extracts, using similitudes more harmonious and more in consistency with the honour due to his station, and to his talents, I would compare him to some great Enchanter, who, by his mellifluous flow of ready and easy language, conjoined with his distinguished power of reasoning, has thrown such a charm of fascination round his readers, as to hold them so spell-bound that they are prevented from using their natural powers of intellect for detecting, and by consequence breaking forth from the delusive system of sophistry, with which he has invested his most attractive volume, but which would be easily

seen through the composition of a less clever and less commanding writer. I would therefore give a warning advice to my readers, not to listen to the bishop's seductive sophisms, but to follow the example of that particular species of serpent to which the Psalmist alludes, and which is known to stop its ears against those attractive sounds of music, by which the enchanters of Egypt were said to allure to their destruction other kinds of a less wary and sagacious description. But, on the other hand, to open them after the most willing and expansive manner, to the sweet sounds of the great spiritual Charmer, offering them a Gospel of the very *freest*, most *unconditional*, and therefore the most peace-giving and soul-comforting character—even a justification through his own vicarious atonement and substituted righteousness, unclogged with any fettering restrictions or conditions whatsoever.

But there is another strong point which will be urged by the advocates of the system, against us—namely, the remarkable passage in Rom. iv. 3—“Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.” Upon this point the bishop writes as follows:—

“Now unto him that worketh is the reward reckoned, not of grace, but of debt; but unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted unto him for righteousness.” This is language which I should feel myself idly employed in endeavouring to explain. It might be possible, doubtless, for human ingenuity to devise some form of expression more entirely free from ambiguity, but it would not, I think, be easy, and I am sure it could answer no useful end. I am sure that if any one now desired to convey the information, that it is the ungodly whom God justifies—those who have violated his law, not those who have obeyed—and that this mode of proceeding is to count the faith which

they have for the righteousness which they have not; and if for this purpose the language of the apostle occurred to him—‘But unto him that worketh not, but believeth upon him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted unto him for righteousness’—I am sure, I say, that such an one would never reject this statement, or add to it, or abridge it, or in any respect alter it, under an apprehension that his meaning could be mistaken by any fair mind. And to attempt anything beyond this by any statement, seems vain. To set about fabricating forms of expression that shall baffle the pernicious ingenuity with which we contrive to evade the natural force of plain language, when it conveys to us what we do not like to hear, betrays an ignorance alike of the imperfections of human language, and of the wiles of the human heart.”

Here, then, a cry of triumph will be raised against me; it will be said that the bishop has got me here into a corner of difficulty—that he has circumvented me—put me into a defile, from which no extrication can be had—that here, at least, I must give up all further argument and discussion, and make a full surrender of myself and my cause at once. So it would seem, indeed, if I were to take what the bishop lays down here as Gospel, to be the truth. Here, I acknowledge, he brings in the whole art of his logic. In the passage quoted, we have a specimen of the bishop’s most smooth and most insinuating manner of writing. By this style he imposes on hundreds of his open and avowed admirers; nay, I would then, in charity, add, that he has imposed on himself. Here he shows himself, as we intimated above, to be the great enchanter; but still I fear not, with truth on my side, to detect the sophistry of his arguments; or, to use a military illustration, the above text, and the chapter from whence it is taken, seem to be the outward parallel of fortification, or the strong tower of defence, to sustain which they have brought together

so many and so powerful instruments of attack ; such large stores and magazines of ammunition, and all the other munitions of warfare, as seem to render it altogether most strong, if not impregnable. To omit imagery, the above text, Rom. iv. 3, and the passages connected with it, would seem to be those which supply the bishop with such seeming Scriptural resources as made his lordship put forth unhesitatingly so startling a passage as that which he put forth at pages 60 and 61, and to which we have already more than once directed the attention of our readers—namely, where the bishop states that “faith, by God’s gracious appointment, is counted for obedience ; that it restores us to that state of favour and acceptance with God,” &c. Well, then, to come at once to close quarters, let us see whether we cannot bring some strong artillery to bear against the position here so long taken up, and so strongly guarded, by names of the most accredited power on all sides. In plain terms, I propose *negatively* to show that the text, Rom. iv. 3, cannot bear the meaning or position which Lutheran divines give to it in their system ; and, secondly, I propose *positively* to lay down that which I am bold to assert is the proper meaning of this most often commented-upon and misunderstood text.

First, then, I support my negative view of the proposition by the following four substantive arguments:—

First, I state that it cannot hold the position which Lutheran divines give to it, as referring to the case of Abraham’s *primary* justification *before God* ; and this for the following clear and express reason :—that if we turn to the Old Testament we shall find the passage meeting us in Gen. xv. 6, for the first time, and under the following circumstances :—Abraham, regretting that he has no heir to his property, and hopeless on account of his age, complains to God that Eliezer, the steward of his household, is to be his heir ; when God,

bringing Abraham out to the open face of heaven at night, desires him to look up and count the stars, and tells him that so numerous shall his offspring be; and that, moreover, from natural descent from himself, and not from another. There it is said that "Abraham believed in the Lord, and it was counted *to him* for righteousness." Surely we have nothing in this passage from whence it can, with fairness, be deduced that Abraham's faith was a cause or reason with God, why he should justify him; for if we turn to the chapters preceding, we shall find that Abraham had been justified long before, even to his own experience and satisfaction, as well as that of others. Thus, for instance, if we come to the twelfth chapter, from verse 1 to 3, we read thus—"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee. And I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Now, if we compare this passage with the same, as quoted by the apostle, Heb. xi. 8, we find Abraham commended for that faith, of which the writer gives the following definition, in the first chapter, according to the bishop's new translation of it, that it is—"a confident expectation of the things for which we hope, and a conviction of their existence, though they be not seen." In other words, we must come to the conclusion, that Abraham had what the Lutheran divines would call justifying faith at that time. Now, if we examine the various circumstances, as narrated, which passed in Abraham's eventful history, between God's calling him to go out into a place which he should afterwards receive for an inheritance, and to which place Abraham, by faith, went, not knowing whither he went, and what occurs in the passage, Gen. xv. 6, we shall find a great in-

L

terval to have elapsed. For we have, first, Abraham's going to and sojourning in the land of Canaan, and his going to Egypt and sojourning there, and his coming up again, going back with his nephew, Lot, to the land of Canaan, where they became so rich in flocks and herds, as to have a strife between their herdsmen. Again, in the fourteenth chapter, we have Abraham gathering three hundred and eighteen of his trained servants, who were born to him in his own house, (which circumstance alone would show a considerable period, during which Abraham had been living in the land,) and going out against the kings, and his singular interview with Melchisedech, &c. Now, one and all these circumstances prove the long space of time which must have intervened between the period of Abraham's getting the notable commendation in Gen. xv. 6, and when, at Gen. xii. 1-3, compared with Heb. xi. 8, he gave evidence that he had that faith which, even according to the Lutheran divines, justified him before God; and hence we conclude, that Gen. xv. 6 could not be stated as appertaining to his *primary justification before God*.

But secondly : the language in the fifth verse proves that the passage in the third verse cannot be brought forward to support the Lutheran theorem of justification by faith only; for of whom is it said, that "his faith is counted for righteousness?" but of him of whom it is affirmed, in the fifth verse, "that he believed on him that justifieth the *ungodly*." But according to the Lutheran system, it is not the ungodly, as such, that God justifieth, but those who, having been ungodly, must first become *converted* before they are justified, inasmuch as they require as conditions for those who are to be justified, that they should have all that faith and repentance so largely described as essential for this purpose by the bishop, in the extracts which I have made from his writings; and to which I refer my readers, desiring them to

notice how reiteratedly the bishop declares the agency of the *Spirit of God* to be necessary for the producing in the soul, so much of faith and repentance, as he there lays down as essential for justification.

Thirdly: when I take into consideration the quotation from Psalm xxxii. 1, 2, as given by the apostle in Romans iv. 6-8, I feel myself still further strengthened in the interpretation which I have offered of the third verse. For what is the blessedness here pronounced by David, but that of the man to whom God "imputeth righteousness *without works*?" But this justification is synonymous with that mentioned in Romans iii. 21,—“Even that righteousness of God *without the law*,” as also that spoken of in Romans iii. 24, where we are said to be “justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.” But what justification is this, but that *vicarious* justification of sinners in Christ; therefore we conclude, that Abraham was justified after this manner before God.

Again: if we take the quotation of the apostle from the thirty second Psalm:—as the non-imputation of sin there spoken of, takes place through the imputation of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, therefore, by parity of reasoning, we conclude that the imputation of righteousness takes place through the vicarious righteousness of Christ, and who, therefore, respecting the whole body of his believing Church, is called “the Lord our Righteousness.”

Fourthly: I find this text is introduced by the Apostle James in his second chapter and twenty-third verse, to show how Abraham was justified *by works*, and not by faith only. See the reasoning of the Apostle, from the fourteenth to the twenty-sixth verses. Luther saw this passage militated against his favourite theorem of justification by faith alone, and his prejudice carried him so far, as to make him deny the authenticity of the Epistle of James, which he called an “*Epistle*

of straw." But so far from this passage of James interfering with the theorem which I have proposed to substitute *as the truth of God*, in opposition to what I call the theorem of man, it goes most strongly to corroborate my reasoning in the matter. For my readers will remember, how, in the opening of this Section, I shewed that faith was introduced into the work of justification, not as evidencing in any manner to the *mind of God* that we should *therefore* be justified before him, but as a witness to our own consciousness and Christian experience, that we had been so vicariously justified in Christ, from all eternity. My readers will remember that I introduced three witnesses as essential to testify to this great fact, and, therefore, the more loudly and strongly they could testify in a man's favour, the more large and abiding would be the peace and joy in believing which such a person would possess; and, therefore, so far from wishing to attenuate faith, by separating it from any of its accompanying graces, the more all these graces would abound, the stronger would be the evidence of faith in such case; and so St. Peter desires us to "give all diligence to add to our faith, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, brotherly kindness, charity," &c.; for the more we would do this, the more we make our calling and election sure—not sure as an evidence before the mind of God, for, "known unto him are all things from the very beginning;" but sure for increased comfort and Christian testimony to our own souls. I cannot see how Lutheran divines can get over the reasoning here; and hence, we find that volumes upon volumes have been written to try to unite St. Paul's and St. James's statements on this point of knotty controversy, by those who hold to the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*. Whereas by the line of argument adopted by me in this work, there seems no explanation of terms at all necessary, but the whole is plain and above board, and harmonious, as all

the statements of the Spirit of God must be, and are, with respect to the various doctrines of divine truth, as revealed in the Scriptures, when these Scriptures are interpreted fairly without regard to any peculiar system-builders or sectarists whatsoever.

I propose to lay down that which, I am bold to assert, is the proper meaning of this text. I would be disposed to throw the whole jet of the controversy here upon the emphatic translation of the pronoun *him*, and rendering the Greek literally. I would make the words run thus—"Abraham believed God, and it was counted to *him*," (that is, to *himself*, not to God, see Greek,) "for righteousness." By throwing the emphasis thus upon the pronoun *him*, we see how the statement of the apostle agrees with the phase of justification by faith, which I am here, all along, upholding. For if we come to consider the characteristic of Abraham's faith, that which rendered it so peculiar, as to make him markedly be called "the friend of God, and the father of the faithful," we shall find it to be, simply, that he took God at his word, so as, no matter how unlikely any transaction was to be, or how contrary to the feelings of natural affection, the command of God was, it was quite sufficient for Abraham to discover, that such a thing was enjoined, or such a thing should be done; there was no hesitancy in the patriarch's mind—no arguments about probabilities—no conjecturing how the thing could take place—it was quite sufficient for him that the Almighty put forth his fiat, and then the obedience of faith at once followed. And so, respecting two circumstances, which gave rise to the commendation in the celebrated text which we are now considering. With regard to the first, that in Gen. xv. 6, Paul gives this ample testimony to its character—"Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy seed be; and being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was

about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb ; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God ; and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform, and, therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness." And with regard to the second example to which this high commendation is annexed, even to Abraham's offering up his son on the altar, James thus bears his testimony — "Was not Abraham our father justified *by works*, when he offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar ; seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and *by works* was faith made perfect ; and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." It seems hard, and quite inconsistent to my mind, how, after such ample testimonies given by these apostles to Abraham's faith, as being accompanied with such remarkable declarations of works ; I say, it seems hard to me to understand how persons (and these so numerous and so great in character and talent) can be found to uphold still such a system, of which Luther, if not the inventor, was, at least, the great propagator, and which made him deny (for a time) the authenticity of the Epistle of James. But, independently, that both Paul and James witness so strongly to works accompanying Abraham's faith, and these of the very highest character, to denote its sincerity and its greatness, I would remark on the general reasoning of James on the passage now before us, and from which he sums up with this conclusion, that, "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also ;" so that if the inspired apostle's reasoning be good for anything, then the Lutheran divines, who advocate the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, must acknowledge themselves guilty, as wishing to be justified by a *dead*, and not by a living faith.

Let us explain the subject in hand by a familiar illustration. Suppose a man heavily laden with debt ;

suppose him to have nothing to discharge his obligation—that he is himself completely bankrupt; suppose, again, that he has a hard creditor urgently pressing him for payment—that he threatens him with the utmost penalty of the law in case of default; suppose that the debtor tells his creditor the peculiarities of his wretched condition, but to no effect, as the creditor argues that nothing short of his full and legal demands will satisfy him; suppose again, that the debtor, in his extremity, remembers that he has a rich brother living at a great distance from him—to this brother, accordingly, he refers the creditor, quite secure of his kindness and generosity. He receives a letter from this brother; the poor debtor breaking the seal of the letter, recognises his brother's superscription upon it—recognises his brother's handwriting—reads out the good news, that he has discharged the whole debt; he believes it to be true, and, in consequence of such faith, he is filled with as much peace and joy, as though he had, in his own person, paid the required sum in solid gold and silver. Such is the effect of his faith upon the debtor himself; but what effect had the exercise of it upon the creditor? None at all, as nought will satisfy him, but the amount of his full demands in the regular currency of the realm. Just so the case is ours, and the illustration clears up the difficulty about Romans iv. 3. We, as sinners, are the bankrupt debtor; the law is the hard creditor; Christ is the generous brother—the sinner's rich friend, who has paid the ten thousand talents that lay against us; we exercise faith in Christ's propitiation, oblation, and satisfaction; and in proportion as we do so, we have peace and joy, and all the other consequences of free forgiveness coming into our soul—that is, in other words—“our faith is counted to us as righteousness;” it stands to *ourselves* with all the amount of comfort and security, as though we ourselves could have discharged the moral obligations that lay against us. But what

influence has this, our faith, upon the law? Does it care at all whether we exercise faith or not, or after what measure we may be exercising it?—that is, whether our faith may be more or less perfect, &c. Nay, nothing will satisfy the law but a righteousness that will come up to its complete demands, both as to its prohibitory and mandatory obligations—nothing but solid payment will do here, even the active and passive obedience of him who “magnified the law, and made it honourable”—the atoning righteousness of him who stood forth at once for his Church, both as its sin-bearer and law-fulfiller, and who is, therefore, expressly called “the Lord, *our* righteousness.”

And now, to sum up all in the way of evidence from what has been now laid down, I make the following analysis:—

First: that whatever Romans iv. 3 may mean, it gives no satisfaction to Lutheran divines, who hold the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*; forasmuch as the faith of Abraham, which receives this high commendation, is not faith alone, as must be perceived from the testimony borne to it by St. Paul.—(Compare Gen. xii. 1-3, with Heb. xi. 1, 8; Gen. xv. 6, with Romans iv. 17-22; and James ii. 23, with Heb. xi. 17-19.) By one and all these passages it would seem, that faith, as it is to be counted for righteousness, is not a faith standing alone, but (to use the language of technical theology) a faith, the “complex” of Christianity, or a faith, accompanied with all those good works, that flow from it, when living and spiritual, as good fruit comes from a good tree.

Secondly: we shall find, by a careful examination of the passages referred to, in which Abraham’s faith is commended, that this phase of justifying faith must differ essentially from that phase of the doctrine of justification laid down in the fourth and fifth verses—“Now, to him that worketh is the reward reckoned, not of grace but of debt, but to him that *worketh not*,

but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly," &c. ; for, as we have proved from the quotation in the third verse by James, the commendation came to Abraham because of his faith having proved itself by good works ; and, therefore, such justifying faith cannot be synonymous with that commended in the fifth verse—namely, of his "who worketh not, but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly." In truth, we believe that Paul all along, by his quotation of Rom. iv. 3, (introduced, as we acknowledge, rather abruptly, according to the style of the apostle, and, therefore, so far forth in its meaning rather involved,) is establishing a distinction between the phase of justification *by grace* and justification *by faith*, even the same distinction which I have endeavoured to maintain and exhibit in the present work. And, indeed, that such must be the case, will appear by his declaration in the sixteenth verse of the fourth chapter, where he says—"Therefore, it is *of faith* that it might be *by grace*," and that, not as the bishop would represent it, as though justification by grace and by faith were *synonymous*, but as being altogether different propositions, which is proved by what I have now argued all along of the nature of the faith here commended, which is a faith accompanied by, and not separate from, *good works*. And, then, if we compare Paul's argument about grace, as given in Rom. xi. 6, we must at once come to the conclusion, that what I have now laid down, (and which is opposed to that laid down by the bishop,) namely, that justification by faith and by grace cannot be the same, but must be considered as different—yea, as opposite propositions ; "for if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace ; but if it be of works, it is no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work."

But, thirdly : when we compare the perfection of Christ's sacrifice, as being the vicarious ground for the justification of the sinner, (and which perfection consists, among other points, in its having been made *once*

and *for ever*,) with the multiplied variations which shall be found in the experience even of the most perfected faith of the holiest believers on earth, as well as those different phases of Abraham's faith, as recorded by the Apostles Paul and James, we must come to the conclusion, that the former cannot be identified with the latter; or, in other terms, that justification by grace, and justification by faith, cannot be considered as the same propositions. For instance, in Heb. x. 12 we have the following words:—"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins *for ever*, sat down at the right hand of God;" and again, fourteenth verse—"By the one offering he hath perfected *for ever*, them that are sanctified." Here we have substance! Here, blessed be God! we have ground for the fullest assurance. Here we stand firmly on the rock, even of Christ's one perfect satisfaction and atonement, and not on the moving quicksand, or the shaking quagmire of man's faith, as fickle and as variable as the wind that blows.

Fourthly: when we compare the testimony given of Abraham's faith by Christ himself, and by the Apostle Paul, in Rom. iv. 3, 17, 22, and in Gal. iii. 16, with Heb. xi. 8 to 19, we must come to the conclusion, that Abraham's faith was of a much higher, more spiritual, and evangelical character, than what the bare historical narratives given in the Old Testament would lead us to imagine. We feel no hesitation ourselves in determining that his faith was of a similar kind, or quality, as to the doctrine of justifying righteousness, as that which we might gather from Rom. viii. 28-32, and as this text has been interpreted by our Church in her seventeenth Article. And I am brought more readily to this conclusion, by the language of Paul in Rom. iv. 5, which, if we apply it to the example of Abraham, in confirmation of what he stated of him from the first to the third verse, then we would have Abraham declaring that he believed in God as having justified him-

self, when he was yet that ungodly sinner, or when he was an idolater. (τοῦ ἀσεβῆ)

Fifthly: however we make the commendatory passage to apply to Abraham's faith, to those who would have Rom. iv. 3 applied to themselves under the Gospel covenant, it must not be by their seeking to be justified *before God* by a faith such as Abraham's, which, from James ii. 23, was one highly commended because of its *works*, whereas, according to Rom. iv. 5, the commendation goes to him that "*worketh not*, but believeth on him that justifieth *the ungodly*;" and then, if we want to know how God justifies the ungodly, we turn to the fifth chapter of Romans, and from the sixth to the tenth verses we shall find it was through the *vicarious* satisfaction of Christ—"for when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the *ungodly*," &c.

Sixthly, and lastly: Whatever may have been the subject-matter of Abraham's faith, when he obtained the commendation in Romans iv. 3, there can be no doubt at all as to what should be the subject-matter of *our* faith, if we are to come under this commendation; for if we read down from the twenty-third to the twenty-fifth verse, we find the apostle thus reasoning—"Now, it was not written for his sake only that it was imputed to him, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead, who was delivered for our offences, and *raised again for our justification*." In plain words, if we are to have our faith counted to us for righteousness, we must have our faith grounded on the two great doctrines which I have been advocating all along in this work, namely, that of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, and that of our vicarious justification in him. This is argued here by the apostle, from the fact of Christ being raised from the dead, "*who was raised again for our*" (that is, the *Church's*, not *his own*) "*justification*;"

excepting so far forth as he stood before God in his *official* character, as the moral representative of his people.

Now it is singular the bishop quotes to the end of the twenty-fourth verse at least *five* times in his work; see pages 98, 355, 360, &c.; and puts a full stop at the end of the twenty-fourth verse, although in our Bibles there is but a colon. Now I would solemnly ask the bishop the reason of his systematic omission of the twenty-fifth verse; and did his lordship perceive, that the last clause of it involved in its meaning, the doctrine of *vicarious* justification in Christ; for as the first clause involves the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of Christ—a doctrine acknowledged by the bishop, (see page 77,) then by congruity of interpretation, the last clause must involve that of vicarious justification? Or, are we to ascribe this systematic omission of the vicarious justification of the Church in Christ to the same reason assigned by him for omitting the other doctrines, to which he alludes in page eight of his preface, and by which, from his language, I should suppose he meant those of divine predestination, election, &c.! After having stated that he omitted nothing which he thought essential to the great truth he wished to establish in his Sermons, the bishop goes forward with the following remarks:—"But through this course of Sermons, I resolved from the first to abstain steadily from such discussions; partly from a desire to avoid embarrassing myself and my hearers by a needless multiplication of subjects, when we had abundant occupation in the one of which I was professedly treating, and partly because I am sure that they who differ, and shall always differ widely, upon those more doubtful, and, I think, far less important points, may agree cordially upon that certain and fundamental truth; or I was anxious to avoid throwing any obstacles in the way of this agreement, by the unnecessary

introduction of questions, upon which it could not be reasonably hoped."

According to this extract, the bishop has industriously omitted *three* leading subjects from the doctrine of justification, and that because, as he says, he did not think them essential to the explanation of the great truth, which he had undertaken to establish. These three subjects are, "the vicarious justification of sinners, in Christ, the fœderal headship of Christ, and the doctrine of the divine predestination and election." These subjects his lordship has omitted, not wishing, as he declares, to embarrass his hearers by any needless multiplication of subjects, &c. I would humbly ask him, whether he was not afraid of embarrassing his explanation of the great truth, by the omission of the above-mentioned three-fold questions, designedly mixed up by the apostle, in his elaborate and logically-arranged argument, on this the great vital question.

And here, once for all, I wish to state, that I have every respect for the bishop's talents, learning, and general character for Christian piety, knowledge, and zeal; for though I have not the honour of a personal acquaintance with his lordship, and know not even his appearance, yet his name is known so well in the whole Irish Church, as to command deserved esteem and commendation; yet whilst I honour him with all the honour due to his rank and abilities; and whilst I respect the principle and motive which actuated the bishop in the omission of these great truths, yet I must question his wisdom and prudence in so doing. For whilst peace is most desirable, and brotherly love and concord are most earnestly to be prayed for, yet, according to the aphorism of the great American philosopher, Franklin, we must take care not to purchase our commodity at too high a price. A striking analogy exists here, between theology and politics; for although peace was most desirable for us

as a nation, and nothing prayed for more by the Queen and her ministers than its preservation and continuance, yet, sometimes in a world under the control of the lord of misrule, war is a necessary evil; and a dishonourable and insecure peace not to be sought for. Just so, there is no person a greater friend of peace than the present writer. I give a most hearty amen to that clause in the Liturgy, that God would give us peace in our day; as likewise that other beautiful petition, "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life;" yet I cannot admit the maxim, that we are to have peace at the sacrifice of any part of the truth. Christ came to this earth as the "Prince of peace," holding the olive branch of pardon and reconciliation in his hand: he came here to proclaim the Gospel of peace; yet in another sense he says, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword."

And again: I find Paul at Antioch, when the truth appeared at all in jeopardy, boldly coming up to Peter, though a great pillar of the Church, and "withstanding him to the face, because he was to be blamed." Moreover, I find the cause of Paul's censuring of Peter to be just, on the ground of the same great fundamental truth for which I have here taken upon me to find fault with the bishop, even that which forms the very vital doctrine for all true godliness and peace. In respect of this great truth, we should all agree in saying—"let heaven and earth pass away, but let not one jot or tittle of the great truth pass away till all be fulfilled," in our inward Christian experience and consciousness. But here I feel perfectly persuaded, that the bishop did not himself perceive the evil consequences, the difficulties and dangers that might result from his giving up three such important questions as those I mentioned as standing in connected view and arrangement with the apostle's argument on this doctrine. These are

so many, that I really do not well know where to make the commencement and termination. However, I shall make a selection of three or four of the most prominent.

The first evil arising out of the bishop's omission of three such important propositions, is, that instead of a broad and luminous view of the apostle's argument, he has given but a garbled and side door view of it. Instead of presenting the truth, like the seamless vesture of Christ woven throughout, from the top to the bottom, he presents it before us in the shape of a torn garment, shorn of three of its most strong and substantial parts. Instead of giving us the advantage of his eminent abilities, and the sanction of his great name, to the setting forth the whole truth as it is in Jesus Christ, by stripping it of the originating portion of the doctrine contained in the last clause of the twenty-fifth verse of the fourth chapter, and the enlarged light thrown upon it by the striking parallelism drawn by the apostle between the two Adams in the last paragraph of the fifth chapter, and the secure establishment given to the whole system, by the bringing the eternal counsels of God's predestination and election to bear upon it, as in the eighth, ninth, and eleventh chapters, the bishop, by designedly passing over all these questions, has so limited himself and his readers, as to afford, I shall not say a curtailed, but altogether an imperfect and untrue statement of doctrine.

A second evil consequence of the bishop's omission, and that which his lordship would view with the greatest regret, is the wide door which it opens out for the advocates of the dogma of *reserve*, to enter with him through it. In one of those charges of his lordship which, familiarly and popularly are called *monster* charges, no person can rise with greater indignation and severity to denounce loudly and openly the conduct of those who, through the specious pretext of the

doctrine of reserve, would keep back from the people the privileged announcement of certain truths, in order to impose their Romanising tenets, under the guise of church principles. These persons bring forward the circumstantial and ceremonial parts of religion, as though they were all and all important, whilst they keep back that which, comparatively, only is of real sterling value. The goods which they would thus bring into the spiritual market for sale, resemble, at best, those brought into the market of the world, by the venders of those things, which are made to conceal the useless and rusty iron beneath, by the superficial lustre and varnish outside. Thus the visible Church of Christ would have imposed upon it, the old iron and rust of Romanism, by such spurious and false pretenders to the truth.

Thirdly : Another evil arising from the bishop's omission, &c., is, the forcing out of their contextual bearings, texts of Scripture, and making them speak a language, and hold a position, which they were never designed by the Spirit of God to do. By such conduct, he lends his aid, not willingly or deliberately, I am free to acknowledge, to those unscrupulous persons, who would hereby build up systems most opposed to the truth of Christ. To give an example; the bishop's most vulnerable point is, that which questions the doctrine of the freeness of the Gospel upon the Lutheran ground of justification by faith only. This would appear from the bishop again and again reverting to this topic, and by the great talent and ingenuity put forth in trying to establish it; all of which would evince a certain soreness, or uneasiness, in his mind upon this topic. (Compare pages 91-95, and 97, 98.) There are three texts that the bishop introduces, or rather forces out of their place, to give him support in this, to him, a vexed question. The texts I allude to are, Romans iii. 24, iv. 16, and xi. 6, none of which can be fully explained without bringing in the

doctrines of the divine predestination and election—doctrines designedly omitted by the bishop, with what consistency his lordship alone must determine.

Fourthly—Another evil consequent on the bishop's omission, &c., would seem to be the limiting of the Spirit of God; it would savour of dictating, or prescribing what it would be right to have communicated to us by God or not; it would appear like passing censure upon the prudence of the apostle, as though if we had been present when he was reasoning out this his elaborated argument, we would say to him, when he would come to the 24th verse—"Now, Paul, you had better stop here, for if you add the 25th verse you will be apt to break up the bond of general agreement amongst Christians on this vital question, upon which it would be well they were all agreed; and you will hold up a subject of contention before their minds by broaching, more especially the last clause of this verse, in which a theme of so much questioning and of controversy is to be found, as that of the vicarious justification of sinners in Jesus Christ. And still more; if you open out the parallelism between Adam and Christ, in the 25th chapter, persons will imagine that you are interfering with the doctrines of the free agency of man, and all human accountability in the matter of justification before God; inasmuch as you hold up such views in the matter of the condemnation of all mankind in Adam, there being no *personal* appearance of his posterity when he sinned; so by parity of contrast you will be represented as holding up similar views on the justification of the redeemed in Christ, there being no *personal* appearance demanded of them either; for when Christ, as their moral representative, being tested, and being found perfect, having obeyed the law perfectly as to all active and passive righteousness, and thereby being pronounced justified by the Spirit, all his saved Church stand from eternity accepted in him." And then, when the apostle would come to the 8th chapter,

M

and writing down the paragraph in the 28th and 29th verses, and the doctrines of the divine predestination and election therein maintained, would be still more evolved by him in the 9th chapter, then, indeed, it would be suggested to the mind of Paul that he was about to create a 'hornet's nest' for himself, and more especially when he was inditing the passage in the 11th verse—"For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth," &c., &c. Here it would be loudly proclaimed that the apostle was interfering with the attribute of God's justice, making him but a partial Judge, and cutting up all human responsibility by the very roots; for then it would be, indeed, stated of God, according to the objection in the nineteenth verse—"Thou wilt then say unto me, why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will?" I would, with all deference, put the following question to the bishop:—Whether his lordship, or any other writer of celebrity like him, would wish to have the same liberty taken with his composition, and think that justice was done to his argument, as he has taken with Paul in the present case? It is acknowledged on all sides, that the apostle, writing his epistle to the Romans—to the Church in the capital city of the empire—bent all the powers of his great and talented genius and mind—no question under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit—to make out a most clear and logical statement of the great fundamental doctrine of the sinner's justification before God. In this epistle there are six chapters mainly doctrinal—that is, in which this discussion is systematically pursued—viz., the third, fourth, fifth, eighth, ninth, and eleventh. Now, the bishop takes notice of only the three first-named chapters, and stops at the twenty-fourth verse of the fourth chapter; but, as he himself tells us, designedly avoids all refer-

ence to the three latter, "which contain doctrines which, however easily and commonly connected with the doctrine of justification," are not, in his apprehension, "necessary to a right understanding and full belief of it;" that is, in other words, the bishop would hold these chapters to be expletive and unnecessary. Now, expletive and unnecessary they certainly are, with regard to that phase of doctrine which he would hold up as the true and evangelical one—namely, **JUSTIFICATION by faith ONLY.**" Nay, I would say they were not only expletive and unnecessary, but embarrassing and upsetting to this famous Lutheran tenet. But they are so far from being expletive and unnecessary, with regard to the true apostolic position in Rom. iii. 28—viz., "that we are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law"—that they are highly corroborative of it, and quite essential to its efficient maintenance and clear elucidation. As I have endeavoured to show all along throughout this section, these two propositions admit of no harmony whatsoever; on the contrary, they stand diametrically opposed one to the other; they are, as we say, antipodes; like the cardinal points of the compass, they can never be brought together; so that, if the one be true, the other must be false; if the one be light, the other must be darkness; if the one be inspired, the other must be uninspired, &c. Would to God the bishop would bring his comprehensive and sagacious mind to bear upon these questions. May I trust that a "door of hope" is opened out to us here by his lordship having so perseveringly refused to have a second edition of his work published, notwithstanding the urgent solicitation of numbers of his admiring friends on this point? Oh, that God would grant that he might see a flaw in his reasoning, however ingeniously and cleverly set forth! For sure I am, but that prejudice so strongly influences us, as sometimes to blind our minds, the bishop could not but perceive an error in

judgment, or an inconclusiveness in some of his argument in his very insinuating and seductive volume. To give an illustration: I would be bold to affirm, that, when the bishop had been Archbishop King's lecturer in divinity, should he have put a question to be reasoned out by the alumni, or pupils of his class, and should they make out a conclusion after the same manner, as the bishop himself has made out his conclusion, concerning the freeness of the Gospel, upon premises similar to those which he himself, in his work, has laid down, they would be dismissed with a verdict of a "non sequitur," or no conclusion being pronounced against them. Surely it must appear, upon the very surface, that there can be no *freeness*, where such shackling conditions are required, and those conditions, moreover, impossible for unassisted human nature to reach unto. Let any unprejudiced person consider only the faith and repentance that are required as qualifications for justification before God, and these even to be defined according to the limited view of them given by the bishop, and it will be impossible, but that he must declare, that there can be no freeness, according to the common meaning of the word, under such circumstances. Seeing, then, that there can be no freeness according to the Lutheran plan of justification by faith alone, and that neither the bishop, nor any other person with the least sagacity or logical discernment, could admit that the term was properly applied in any of the usual occasions of natural life after a similar manner; seeing, moreover, that the bishop is so determined an advocate for the freeness of the Gospel, that on no account would he give up this point, it being one of its leading and characteristic features; what can be done but to give up the old mode of exposition of the doctrine as unscriptural and untenable, and, therefore, to fall back upon that, which I here propose to substitute in its place, even that of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ,

founded on the decrees of God concerning the Church to be saved in him from eternity. And here, I would trust, that a door of hope is opened out before us. For although the bishop has, as he has told us, designedly omitted to give us his mind on this latter point; yet, as a single straw will show to the observant eye the way in which the water may be flowing, however stagnant on the surface, and occult as to its deep current such may seem to be—such, I would say, can be discovered in the mind of the bishop, as to his holding of the moderate Calvinistic interpretation of the Seventeenth Article; for if we turn to the 94th page of his work, we have the following isolated communication of his mind:—“or commemorating his *eternal* purposes in Christ concerning his Church!” The very name of the Redeemer forces Paul, as it were, to glance at the benefits which we owe to him, and at the way in which they have been secured to us. “According to the *eternal* purpose which he purposed in Christ our Lord, in whom we have boldness and access with confidence, in the faith of him.”

Would that God would open the eyes of his understanding to see, through the powers of his large and comprehensive mind, not only the truth of the three great doctrines which I have been endeavouring to bring forward with all the due prominence of character and of place, in the Christian system, as they deserve, but also that he would grant him to have all his affections so engaged in these wondrous subjects, as that now, that his admirers are calling for a second edition of his work, instead of gratifying them on this point, that he would write a *new* work altogether for the gratification, not merely of his friends, but for the benefit of the general Church in this country; in which he would give to these mighty themes all the demonstration, that his most large and lucid reasoning powers would admit. Thus, indeed, would not only these truths maintain their proper position, as connected

with the doctrine of justification in the bishop's mind, but likewise through the prestige of his high rank, abilities, and piety, he would so sway the minds of the really serious and spiritual clergy amongst us, as to bring them likewise over to his opinions. Then we should have the Lutheran tenet of justification by faith *alone*, the dangerous device of man (invented to subserve the purposes of his spiritual pride, by preventing him withdrawing himself altogether out of the way from a personal appearance for a justification before God) made no longer the shibboleth of the party, but we would have the grand doctrine of grace—the vicarious justification in Christ, substituted in its room. Thus would the bishop, with a long train of evangelical clergy, that would, no doubt, be influenced by his example and his argument, taking up this doctrine, as the Ithuriel spear of truth, scotch the snake—even detect and expose the spirit of evil, that has been, for so many centuries, distilling the poison of Arminianism into the ears of our mother—the visible Church—and arousing her from her deep and most fatal sleep—make her take up that position for the testimony of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, which, according to common prescription, belongs to her dignity and her station; or, to borrow a still more military illustration, then would they no longer, taking their weapons from the arsenals of man, but being panoplied with the armour of righteousness on the “right hand and on the left,” and more especially drawing forth from their too long concealment, the three important points of doctrine, to which I have all along given the precedence in this discussion, as the three engines of the largest magnitude and bore, found in the artillery of heaven, would so plant them with steady and well-directed aim, against the walls and bulwarks of evil, so high, and hitherto thought so impregvably built up in our land, as to shake them to their very foundations; that so entering within the breach, might so break up

the morale of the besieged, as to cause, if not their destruction from amongst us, at least their precipitated and inglorious flight, so as to make them a comparatively easy prey to those who may come after; or to drop metaphor, in plain language, then would the bishop, and the numerous host of his brethren, that were to follow the guidance of his counsel and direction, become such blessings in their generation, as to produce such a change and transformation in the writings, the principles, and the preachings of the age, as to bring about a kind of second reformation, by the transfusion of these the doctrines of originating grace into their Gospel system. For then there would be no longer heard among them a kind of mongrel theology, half evangelical, and half Arminian, which usurps such deadly influence over the preachers and their congregations. It is not that I think myself somebody, as the saying is, that I presume thus to protrude my views upon either the bishop, or those of my distinguished brethren, who may be holding the popular pulpits of the land, distinguished alike for the most glowing eloquence, the most fervent zeal, the warmest devotion, and the very highest spirituality of mind. Many of those noble, fine men, whom I have the privilege of knowing, I not only admire and respect, but really affectionately love, and therefore it is, that as a father, *as to age*, in Christ, I now presume to dictate to them in the way of the very most kindly admonition and counsel; not that I imagine myself to be equal to any, even the very least of them, in those gifts and endowments which have made them the shining preachers of their day; but having the greater experience, in consequence of the great length of time spent by me in the ministry, I would wish to be an humble and honoured instrument of imparting to them, those views of the doctrines of grace, and more especially that great fountain one—"the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ"—which sustain my

own soul in such rich and rapturous consolations, now that I must, in a most brief period, according to the course of nature, bid an eternal adieu, alike to the joys and sorrows—to the prosperities and adversities—to the hopes and disappointments—the manifold cares, vexations, and temptations of this most trying, and uncertain, and unsatisfactory pilgrimage of life here below. With humble submission to the bishop, and my reverend brethren, I would say, “*Excelsior*” should be ever the Christian motto. As a Church, as well as individuals, we should *go forward*; stagnation, no less than retrogression, is a sign of decay and death; *advance* must be our watchword. According to the system of development now so much spoken of, and as highly lauded on every side, the Church and her bishops and pastors, now in the nineteenth century, are called upon to get before that of the fifteenth century, as to views of doctrine, articles, and Christian experience. It was never intended—it never could, I suppose, or at least it never should have been so intended—to have the articles of the Church of England bound, like an interminable chain of bondage, round the necks of her children, after the same manner that the Church of Rome has bound the articles and decrees of the Council of Trent round the necks of her children, and which bind them up to all hopelessness as to any reformation, or regeneration, for all future generations. The Church of England has generously and wisely left one article more especially as a safety-valve for all tender, and inquiring, and susceptible consciences here; this is the sixth article, which declares that, “whatsoever is not read in the Holy Scriptures, nor can be proved thereby, is not to be required of any person to be believed as necessary to salvation;” and, therefore, if we, of the nineteenth century, think that any of those, our worthy forefathers—however to be respected and to be highly venerated for their eminent learning and wisdom—for their primitive faith,

piety, and zeal, may have erred in drawing up any of those numerous and minutely detailed articles of faith, which they have transmitted to us, we are not bound, according to the above reserve and salvo of conscience, to stand by it, inasmuch as by our advancement with the enlightenment of the age, in which the Providence of God has cast our lot, we may hereby discover some flaw and error opposed to Scripture in such statement; and, therefore, if, according to the above view and principle, we find a flaw or Scriptural error in the eleventh article, and the homily to which it refers us, for further explanation, we are not obliged to continue our subscription to such. And here, also, a door of hope seemed to be opened before me, as respects the opinions of the bishop, for, at page 136, I find the following passage:—"To the Bible, in a question of Scriptural truth, I desire to confine myself;" but as I was about to enter in at this door of hope, just like as if entering into a door amongst us, which, having one of those ingenious locked-up springs called "porters," and which makes the door ready to slam back in your face; so I find connected with this passage another, which would seem to bar my entrance, at least as openly and unreservedly as I would have desired, for the bishop adds—"To the articles, homilies, and liturgy in any question concerning the principles of our Church, I desire to confine myself." Now, if the bishop means that we are bound to pay an unreserved, and undeviating, and an universal allegiance to the above authority, where goes then, I would be glad to ask, the discretionary power given in the sixth article? or where is the liberty contained in the first sentence of the bishop recorded above? or how far better off would we be then than the slaves to Rome's system, in consequence of the anathemas pronounced against all those in her community, that dare to resist the decrees of the Council of Trent, declared by her to be irreversi-

ble, and abiding always? For though the bishop declares, that "to the Bible alone he desires to confine himself, in matters of Scriptural truth," and that he would be sorry to make his "discussion of the doctrine a warfare of great names," yet, if he uses the latter sentence to negative the former, by binding us, for instance, by an unchangeable rule, to the views of those who drew up our articles, homilies, and liturgy, where goes then the apparent liberality and freedom of his first proposition? But on this subject I shall not now enter, intending to take it up and examine it in detail, under the seventh head, amongst other objections that I feel aware I subject myself to, by having broached a theme for such a new and wide discussion. Before I would pass forward to my general subject, I would wish just to put one question—namely, which of the following two would be considered the real true son of the Church? Whether it would be he who, seeing some black spot and disfiguring blur upon the face of his aged mother, would not, from indolence, or fear of creating excitement, or any other selfish motive, lift up his hand or voice to have it removed; or whether it were he who was determined to remove the disfigurement, notwithstanding the risk of exciting the momentary displeasure of his mother herself, or raising persecution, or trouble, or opposition against himself from other and various quarters? But to return from this digression.

I shall state one leading benefit which must arise to the popular preachers alluded to above, as well as to the several congregations under them, by their adopting the great theme that I have proposed in this work as the fountain-source of the sinner's justification before God, rather than the unscriptural tenet taken up by Luther at the time of the Reformation, and unhappily brought in as an article of faith by our reformers, in contradistinction and opposition to another great article of faith proposed by them for our adop-

tion, and the inconsistency of calling for a subscription to two such opposing articles, I intend, by and by, to expose.

The benefits to be derived by the preachers and their congregations may be divided into the following twofold distinctions:—First, a negative benefit; and, secondly, a positive one. The negative benefit is that getting rid of the maudlin sentimentalism—"the daubing the wall with untempered mortar"—the crying "peace, peace, when there is no peace"—and, if I may use the expression, the evangelical legalism, and many other evils growing out of the adoption of, at best, an imperfect, if not an unscriptural view of this great doctrine, as necessarily as the gangrene arises from the corrupted constitution within; and thus a corresponding reciprocal benefit will arise to the congregations themselves. Preachers will no longer hear of excited frames among the members of their congregations, produced by nervous temperaments, in consequence of consciences uneasy through fear of apostasy, responsibility, of judgment to come, or their desiring, in a legal spirit, to be doing something—(according to the false interpretation of the text, to "work out their salvation with fear and trembling,) to be doing something for God, or for the good of their souls; as though their justification had not been effected for them from eternity—as though they were working to obtain life, and had not already obtained it—not for salvation, but from salvation—not to obtain mercy, because they have already obtained it, viz., by their vicarious justification in Christ, &c.: these and many other bad results and temptations to be found clinging to a system possessing so much of the leaven of Arminianism, by me here so strongly opposed, being taken out of place, the real positive benefit of the true doctrine now proposed to be substituted, will come up gradually into play. I say gradually by premeditation; for, at first, when the preachers will bring forward those three great propositions boldly and promi-

nently, as making up the chief part of the truth, which they shall have to deliver from Sabbath to Sabbath, they must expect that, falling powerfully upon the too sensitive and fastidious ears of many of those whom they address, great dissatisfaction will at first arise—many shall be offended—much controversy shall arise—many explanations being on all sides demanded, and these not satisfactorily answered, many of the heads of families, and those perhaps the more opulent, the more noble and great among them, will throw up their pews, and refuse to sit under such preaching any longer. These and such like results must be expected—the dead calm being broken up, the enemy will rage—storm will be excited; but, like the wildest tornado in nature, when the storm subsides, many of the deadly vapours and noxious fumes arising from too long stagnation, being blown away, the air becoming calm and serene again, healthfulness comes up as the blessed and much-desired issue. So I would desire the preachers to take courage, and go forward, and persevere; the chaff will become separated from the wheat; and however they must deplore the absence of many hitherto favouring members, and, consequently, deserted seats, and failing income, &c.; yet it may be but for a time; perhaps those most estranged at first may come back with greater zest and desire; and even should the case be otherwise, consolation must be taken from the declaration of the Apostle John, 1st Epistle ii. 19—“They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.” And thus the minds of the preachers themselves shall be filled with such glorious consolations and majestic views of the love of God, which must flow into their souls through those great channels of free and unconditional grace and mercy coming to them through the instrumentality of these

three most precious truths—truths but too long neglected and cast aside by the Church, but now to be brought forward, and cherished, and cultivated with all the prominence and power, that they so entirely merit at the believer's hands, that they shall appear with all the freshness of eloquence, that a new subject, and that, moreover, one of such vast importance and sublimity gives. They will not only astonish and captivate their hearers, but they will become a source of astonishment, so to speak, to themselves. Thus a surprising field for the exercise of the imagination shall be unfolded before them, and such vistas of the undefined goodness and surpassing benevolence of the Deity shall be, from day to day, opened out to their seduced and enraptured understandings. And thus, from Sabbath to Sabbath, they will find inexhaustible themes of varied discourse to bring before the delighted and enchanted hearers—enchanted with them, not now, as formerly, by reason of their enticing words, delivered in the way of frothy verbiage, or say, even mellifluous eloquence, but delighted and enchained by their preachers, because in their discourses they now find *substance*, even that which feeds and satisfies their heaven-thirsty souls. Their preachers are now to them like the good householders bringing forth from their well-furnished stores within, copiously and variedly, things new, as well as old. Their language, as well as their arguments, drop with unction into their ears, being brought forth under what we would say “the power and the demonstration of the Spirit.” The preachers being taken up themselves no longer with the profitless task of searching into their own inward experiences—of examining into the qualities of their faith and repentance—of their godly sorrowings and mournings, &c., as the grounds of spiritual peace and hope, now draw these, as well as every other rich spiritual consolation, from the great originating well-head—the fountain-source of mercy and of all divine

illumination, even the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ, coming down upon them from all eternity, through the electing love—the predestinating councils of the everlasting Father. The preachers themselves, I say, drinking in, revivingly and perpetually, of the waters of life, no longer build up their hearers in the vain discipline of searching into their frames and feelings, after the Lutheran manner of the pleaders of justification by faith alone, as a warranty thereby of obtaining the divine approbation, and of laying the foundation for Christian assurance. They no longer impose upon them this fearful task, Sisyphus-like, of rolling thus the stone against the hill. They no more desire them to be “spending their money for that which is not bread, and their labour for that which satisfieth not.” They engage them no longer to be contemplating what *they can do for God*, in order to procure this great item in their salvation—how far they can frame out that which may be as a formal plea or cause for forgiveness before God; but they rather engage them to occupy themselves in scanning, over and over again, *what God has done for them*. They rivet the captivated and enraptured understandings and imaginations of their subdued astonished hearers by the marvellous manifestations of the love of God to sinners, displayed more especially in the great gift of his Son to die for them, and all the outgoings of surpassing honour, riches, and glory, laid up for them thereby in the countless ages of eternity itself. “He that spared not his Son, but gave him up for us all, will he not with him freely give us all things?”

Just, as we say, that the mountainous and Alpine districts of the earth are those places where poetry and song have been, generally speaking, brought forth, cradled, and nurtured. And why here more than in flatter, and richer, and more cultivated regions of a country, but that the mind, having thrown before it continually thereby the sublimer effects and combina-

tions of nature, corresponding feelings and impressions of sublimity are imparted to it. Just so, preachers and hearers having now to do with those mysteriously grand and high doctrines of eternal grace and love, and all the towering, mountain prospects of bliss and glory undefined, pure, rapturous, heavenly, spiritually, to gaze upon, become, in like manner, proportionably influenced and inspired. The songs of Sion—the poetry of the redeemed—even the praises of their everlasting God, the Father of Mercies, who brought them out of darkness into his marvellous light—"the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost given to them"—forms the key-note to which their harps are strung. To them grace is now "a charming sound in their believing ears;" to it they "sing and make sweet melody in their hearts unto the Lord."

But as the subject here entered on admits of vast expansion, one remark more must limit the amount of the benefits to be derived to preachers and congregations from the doctrine here proposed. The remark I wish to make is, that thus shall be taken away from a scoffing and an infidel world that which now forms the ground of their loud laughter and triumph—namely, the glaring inconsistency and anomaly that constantly presents itself, where are seen, Sabbath after Sabbath, the various equipages bringing their owners, with the strictest regularity, to sit under the preachings of those who are termed the great evangelical proclaimers of the Gospel of mercy, in the various popular pulpits of the metropolis, which brought them on the nights of the week before, either to the ball-rooms, or the play-houses, or other scenes of vain and luxurious assemblage, which are continually taking their rounds in all those places, where vast populations of rank and fashion are congregated.

The above anomaly, or contradiction, is to be accounted for by the fact, that those rich, and great, and worldly

persons are attracted to the Sunday-going proceedings, and to their balls, and theatres, from the same motive; which is, that as these latter have been invented in order to keep the mind from preying upon itself, by driving it to that which is momentarily exciting and pleasurable; so of the former likewise. And thus as there are "diversities of gifts," but the same spirit in the preachers; so, this diversity of gifts meets with corresponding diversities of tastes amongst the hearers; and so, one class of hearers selects the intellectual preacher—another class selects the solemnizing preacher—another class, the eloquent and theatrical declaimer—whilst a fourth prefers to sit under what is popularly styled the honest Irish mannerism; but in one and all of these classes, and others that might be named, are the preachers like unto that which was affirmed of the Prophet Ezekiel in his day—"Lo, thou art to them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument, for they hear thy words, but they do them not." (Ezek. xxxiii. 32.) Thus do such persons go away from the churches as they went away from their ball-rooms and theatres—pleased and excited by what they may have heard, but equally unimpressed and unedified, as to any really spiritual improvement, either in principle or practice. But far different would be the result were those magnificent, and stupendous, and sublime doctrines, for all grace and godliness, habitually and industriously propounded from the several evangelical pulpits of the land; for then would the preachers themselves, being deeply and experimentally influenced in their own hearts, with those grand and vast exhibitions and manifestations of the divine love poured out so richly, freely, and unconditionally upon them in Jesus Christ, come forth with a weight of argument, with the fervid lips of eloquence, and the beauty of varied illustration, so as to produce corresponding influences upon those who would then be the

privileged listeners to such a pure Gospel—the real glad tidings of salvation and pacification through the blood of Jesus Christ—so as to make those “lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God,” either vacate their seats in the assemblies of the saints, or else, from a real change and conviction of their inward principles, give up those week-day inconsistent practices, which I have above denounced.

Two observations must now conclude the present head, pursued already to so great a length. As we live in an age wherein the Word of God has been so cheapened, through the instrumentality of the many great, benevolent missionary societies amongst us, as to be brought not only to the homes of all who wish to have it in the land, but to be actually offered “without money and without price” to each individual, who desires to receive it at the minister’s hands; so these two observations shall have respect to the blessed book, which has had its free course by being so widely circulated amongst us.

The first observation is, that the Bible seems to be composed of so many tracts, to the common observer or reader of it, so apparently without connection—loosely thrown together; it is composed of so many compartments of literature, and these so various and diverse, one from the other, that I would compare the whole, according to this naked and surface view of it, to the fabled labyrinth of the minotaur, in which the greater number wander about from one intricate way, portion, or apartment to another, until they completely lose the proper direction in which they should go, and, perhaps, never are extricated for anything of final rescue or salvation. Hence the necessity for the people to be well instructed and carefully grounded in those three doctrines of free and originating grace, which I have urged with all the force of argument and illustration that I am capable of; and which three doctrines form, in my opinion, the great leading and silken thread

N

of truth, which is to guide our feet safely, easily, and pleasantly through the otherwise intricate mazes of the Scriptures.

The second observation I would make in connection with the Scriptures is, that truth is therein to be found, like the well-coiled rope, which, if you wish to loose, it is necessary that you begin at the one end, and then, with ease and without resistance, you can, with comparatively little strength, draw forth each coil, one after another, until the whole cable be unwound, even to its very fullest stretch and length. Whereas, if you try to effect this purpose by commencing at the centre, or even at points far above it, though you may bring your greatest ingenuity, and your greatest strength—and that strength carried out even to Herculean prowess—to bear upon it, your labour will, nevertheless, be all in vain. Just so, I would say, a necessity lies upon us, when we would evolve the saving truth of the Gospel of grace and mercy, either for the comfort of our own souls, or for the instruction and consolation of those that hear us, to commence at that which forms the grand initiating doctrine of salvation—the starting-post for all peace and godliness—even that of “redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace;” or, in other terms, the doctrine of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ. Thus we shall have this great doctrine for all peace and godliness revealed in its fullest exposition and outgoing of blessedness; whereas, if we commence at any other point in the lower range of truth—and still more should that be a false point, such as I have endeavoured to prove that system to be against which I have in this present work been writing—then shall we expose ourselves, and those with whom we have to do, to a worse than useless expenditure of time and labour, as there shall remain many of the layers of doctrine altogether unrolled before us: whilst of the remainder—that is, of those over which we may seem to have ex-

exercised such power as to draw them forth—there will appear to be no systematic order or arrangement, but the whole will be full of knotty entanglements, and inextricable confusion.

IV.—I come now to give my own view of the position which faith holds in the matter of justification. And here, first, I declare, as strongly as words will admit of, that I can hold faith, in no respect whatsoever, to be a *justifier*, a *satisfier*, or a *procurer* of justification before God. As I have reasoned, all along, largely in this work, respecting the futility or vanity of faith, for such a grand and most vital issue, I shall not stop here to reiterate any arguments on the subject. I prefer now at once to state what place is assigned, according to the testimony of the Word of God, to faith in this important matter. Its office, according to this testimony, is threefold—namely, a *revealer*, a *receiver*, and a *testifier*.

First, then, as a *Revealer*. Under this aspect or office-character, Paul introduces faith to our notice, in this celebrated epistle, wherein the doctrine of justification, as I have oftentimes occasion to mention, is more largely set forth, and is more logically defined, than in any other part of the divine Record; and wherein, therefore, we would reasonably expect, that the most accurate definition of its position and service would be exhibited and maintained; and thus, if we turn to Romans i. 16, 17, we find the following statement of it drawn up:—"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," &c.; "for therein is the righteousness of God *revealed* from faith to faith, as it is written, "The just shall live by faith." According to this testimony, faith is not that which justifies the sinner before God; "the righteousness of God" is what effects this. Faith, by the declaration of Paul here, cannot in anywise be considered the formal plea, or cause, of the sinner's justification; it only reveals

to the soul of the believer the righteousness of God, as this formal plea or cause. Faith thus becomes to the soul what the eye is to the body; it lets in heaven's light upon the soul; and, therefore, the more perfect, the more open and enlarged this eye is, the more will the blessed streams of spiritual light, as they come down from God, the "Father of lights," flow into the soul, through him, who is expressly called the "Sun of righteousness." And here I get another argument against those who would state that faith, when it justifies, must be alone, or separate from all the fruits of faith. Now, this cannot be the case if we take the above as a fair illustration of the subject; for surely we could not say that the eye must be separated from all its qualities, or natural effects and results, when it is to be used for the above purpose, nor can we admit that any process of surgery must be necessary to be undergone every time that the eye is to be opened, in order to let in the outward light of heaven upon us. Neither must the advocates of the system which I am here denouncing, take the observation of Christ in Matt. vi. 22, (according to the singular translation given of it,) be brought as an argument against me—namely, where he says, "If thine eye be *single*, thy whole body shall be full of light." For every Greek scholar knows that which is translated here "single" (*απλούς*) means healthy, clear, &c.; and, therefore, as the natural eye cannot be in too clear and healthy a state to perform effectually its proper work; so neither can faith, as the spiritual eye, be too expanded and perfect to perform its office engagement likewise. The apostolic prayer should ever more become us—"Lord increase our faith;" and so accordingly I would interpret the words—"from faith to faith," as inclusive of this increase of faith. I would wish to remark in passing, that I do not desire, by any means, to disparage, or think lightly of faith; nay, on the other hand, I wish to give it all the honour due to

it, so long as it keeps that place assigned to it by God, in the matter of justification. Now this must never be to usurp before the mind Christ's position, which is to hold the first distinction without any rival, or equality, or substitution whatsoever, being admitted. Faith is a very good servant under Christ, its great Lord and Master; yea, we will say, as connected with Christ, and as doing his more immediate work, faith is Christ's best, highest, and most confidential servant. But Christ never admits a substitute to do his work. He is able and willing to do his own work, and that, moreover, always. Christ is not like the sovereigns of the earth, who may sometimes go away from their dominions, or else these dominions being too vast and widely extended, are obliged to appoint deputies, or vice-gerents in their absence; but Christ is never absent, nor can his dominions be ever rendered so capacious, but that he can, and will, be everywhere present in them. The language of the bishop can never be applied as appropriate to faith—namely, “that it can be accounted for obedience before God—that it restores us to that state of favour and acceptance with him in which the perfect righteousness of his law would have sustained us, had we been able to have attained to that righteousness, and to have preserved it.” For this language would go to make faith assume that office, for which, according to the above reasoning, it can never be suited nor required. No; according to the illustration, which I have first given of it, the language of the psalmist, (Psalm cxxiii. 2,) is suited to be the language of faith—“Behold! as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us.” I said that faith was the spiritual eye to let heaven's light in upon the soul. What part of heaven's light? First, and principally, that which is to enlighten us with regard to the mode of God's dealing with us

in pardoning our sins. This is, that which the apostle directs us to in the passage, (Romans i. 18,) "Therein the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith." But why does the apostle concentrate the revelation made to the soul by faith to this one point? For the following, among many other reasons, that might be adduced:—First, God being eternally blessed in himself, wishes his creatures to be happy in their measure, even as he himself is happy; but man, to use an astronomical illustration, has gone off in the most *aphelion* distance, by reason of his apostasy in Adam from God. God wishes to bring him back into the nearest *perihelion* approximation to himself. But this was to be effected only by the covenant undertaking of Christ with the Father, in which covenant the Father promised to Christ to give him an elect seed, such as would satisfy him for the travail of his soul; by the offering of which, "once for all, he suffered, the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God." Hence then the necessity of faith seizing first on the righteousness of God, for bringing us, who were aliens from him by our evil deeds, now nigh to him in the way of reconciliation through Jesus Christ. It is not by what we can do for God that we are thus reconciled, but by what God in Christ has done for us; it is not by anything wrought in the way of Christian experience within us by the operation of the Holy Spirit, that we become justified before God; but by what Christ has done, *independently* of us, to satisfy the divine justice, and to make honourable the demands of the law, that we are to be so justified. In this matter God takes no account of our faith or repentance, let such be ever so pure and perfect; he makes no estimate of what we are to him; but he takes his estimate from what Christ, as our moral substitute, is before him. Thus we become accepted before God by a "righteousness not our own; the righteousness not being our own excludes boasting; and being perfect, excludes anxiety; thus the conscience

becomes at once unladen, and yet not puffed up:"* hence also the ground of our peace with God; not from anything by which we have drawn nigh to him, but altogether that which has been done without us by Christ, through whom alone God has drawn nigh to us; and the sense of this reconciliation revealed to the soul from faith to faith, produces a reciprocal impression upon the believer's mind, or, in other words, the aphorism of John becomes verified in his experience—"He loves God, because God has first loved him."

But again: faith concentrates its revelation to the righteousness of God, because this concentrates all other blessings to the believer's soul. The barrier of repugnancy or opposition being removed, or perfect reconciliation being effected, all sins pardoned and covered, there is full scope now given to God for the pouring forth of every spiritual mercy on him who thus stands accepted before him in the beloved. There is nothing now that infinite love is able to bestow—that the redemption in Christ was equal to the purchase of—or the soul, according to its capacity of faith, is capable of receiving, that is not ready to be poured out upon it, to the very utmost prodigality of bounty. All this, and more than we can express, becomes revealed through the operation of faith on the soul. We may now apply for our increased joy and peace in believing the passage given by Paul in 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, even that God hath revealed unto us by the Spirit, those things which were freely given to us by God, of which he declares that the (natural) "eye hath not seen, nor the (natural) ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of (the natural) man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him." Just as when a traveller being asked if he has seen such or such splendid scenery, numbers of which are

* Newman on Justification, p. 26.

to be found in the most prodigal variety, (*e.g.*) in the Swiss or Italian landscapes, he replies that he has seen such a lake. Well, by the expression is meant that he has not only seen the lake which, as being the principal feature in the landscape, is only named by him, although, when at the spot, his eye luxuriated in taking in the various combinations of beauty, such, for instance, as the lofty mountains with their varied forms, and clothed downwards with the rich summer foliage, &c., &c.; so, when faith is said to reveal the righteousness of God to the soul, it is not meant that by such an expression faith becomes so insulated upon this one, the largest topic of the divine blessing, but that with, and through it, it takes into the field of view every other spiritual benediction that comes down, through this channel of grace and mercy, to the soul of the believer.

But secondly: faith is also a *receiver* according to that passage in John i. 12—"But as many as received him, to them gave he power, (*i.e.*, the privilege, licence, &c., *g.k.*) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Here faith comes up under a different illustration; it is no longer the eye that reveals the righteousness of God, &c.; but now it is the spiritual hand that handles of the things of life. As we stated, in explaining the former paragraph, faith was in the attitude of an upper servant under Christ. Now, the business of an upper servant, in the service of the rich and great man, is very much that of taking or receiving messages from his master, and delivering such to those to whom they were addressed. Just so, faith receives the great message of God to man, even the Gospel of glad tidings of reconciliation through the propitiation in Christ Jesus. Yea more, faith accepts the message, makes it its own, &c.; but because it performs one and all these offices, surely it cannot, with any propriety, be stated that, therefore, it was the formal cause or plea, why

the message of mercy and grace had been sent, no more than as in the former case, when faith was illustrated under the comparison of the spiritual eye, that, therefore, it could be said, that it was the formal plea or cause why the light of heaven was permitted to shine all around. Neither must we allow ourselves to suppose that, because of the expressions here used—namely, that those got the privilege to be called the sons of God, who received him, and who believed in his name, that, therefore, these latter were to be considered as the necessary conditions of all persons before they really be the sons of God; for the language of the thirteenth verse would prevent any such supposition—“Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Now, according to this latter language the doctrine is, that if ever we become the sons of God, it must be, as is stated in the seventeenth article, through the divine election of us in Christ, before the foundation of the world. But it is one thing to be actually separated in the divine counsels to be the children of God, and quite another thing to know and value this our elected privilege. Many a person may be the child of some great one, without knowing his distinctive rank and privilege. He may be either too young, or too ignorant, or indolent; or some other cause may prevent his knowing of it, so as either to value or to improve the distinctive honour put upon him. Just so, there are numbers who go on from day to day, without coming up to the point of attainment in the thirteenth verse, of whose real possession of the dignity, we cannot in the judgment of charity question. Indeed if we were only to put down such as real believers, as come to the standard of Christian privilege, or of their high calling in Christ, we should reduce the estimate of those who were to be the really redeemed in Christ, to so low a scale, that our minds, becoming so chagrined and

desponding, we should be forced continually to be crying out with the disciples of old—"Lord, are there few that be saved?" Alas! few Christians indeed seem to understand at all, the high and eminent platform of spiritual elevation, which they are, as believers, called to stand upon; fewer still walk after this their high dignified position. How few, for instance, are walking habitually through the practical application of the doctrine of the resurrection, in the power of an endless life, or are "sitting with Christ in the heavenlies," &c. &c.

Again: faith appears as a *testifier*. In confirmation of this view of faith, I quote 1 John v. 10—"He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself;" that is, faith is a witness to ourselves—to our own consciences, and inward experiences—that we are the justified of God in Christ; but it is no witness to God, why he should have put us into Christ for such justification. Faith is an evidence satisfactory to ourselves, to prove to our inward experiences that we stand accepted in the beloved—that we are complete in Christ, &c.; but it is no evidence before God, why he should have put us into such benefits. Faith—and that in proportion as the eye is single, *i.e.* healthy and clear, couched from every film of earthliness—testifies, that we are in the line of election for final salvation; but it doth not testify to God, why he should have so put us into the line of his election for salvation. There is a two-fold reconciliation spoken of in the Scriptures, and according to such two-fold reconciliation, there is a two-fold phase of justification spoken of. This two-fold reconciliation, we have placed before us in 2 Cor. v. 18–21. The first reconciliation is that which was given to God's justice, and his broken law, by the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ. The second reconciliation is that given by us to God; namely, by our laying aside the carnal enmity and hatred of Him,

bound in every human heart by nature. This latter is effected by the sense of the first reconciliation being brought to the soul, through the instrumentality of faith. And thus comes up the second phase of justification, to correspond with the second phase of reconciliation here spoken of. And indeed this would appear to be the great reason for the introduction of faith into the Gospel system of grace at all.

The argument here, would seem to be after the following order : God's justice having got its perfect vindication in that which Christ did for the justification of his church, then nothing that the members of the church could do, could either add to or take from such perfect satisfaction. God, then, was at liberty to justify as many as he pleased out of the successive generations of mankind, without taking into consideration either the obedience or the non-obedience of such ; that is, without asking any one of them to do any thing towards their justification, which was accomplished for each and all of them before they were born, by the vicarious or the substituted righteousness of Christ, for all that were to be redeemed by him, past, present, or to come. But God demands faith and repentance from all the adult redeemed in Christ. Is it to qualify them in any respect whatsoever, for justification before himself ? Nay, that would be for him to demand a kind of secondary compensation for his justice, already previously satisfied to the utmost power of its requirements by what Christ did, in our assumed human nature. That be far from the God of the whole earth to do. "God is now faithful and just to forgive us our sins." "In whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins through his blood." Well, then, why is faith required ? Not for any thing, either as a condition or a qualification for justification before God, but altogether for the benefit that it, and its kindred grace, "repentance," can do in the way of reflected influence upon our

own souls; that is, faith apprehends that for which it hath been previously "apprehended in Jesus Christ." Faith comes up to testify to our calling and election in Christ—it gives to us the sense or evidence of our being justified, even from everlasting, as one of the chosen members of his redeemed church—it comes to tell us, that God is at peace with us, and thereby produces the corresponding feeling, so as to make us to become at peace with him.

That I am right in this exposition or theory which I have adopted throughout my work, and more especially the argument concerning the position which I have assigned to faith and repentance, in the matter of justification before God, will receive further corroboration by directing our mind to the early addresses delivered by the apostles, when under the immediate pentecostal effusion and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and through the instrumentality of which preachings, so many thousands were converted, and enrolled by baptism, as members of the Church of Christ.

Let us take, for example, the summing-up appeal of Peter to his hearers, in Acts ii. 38—"Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus, for the remission of your sins," &c. And again, his appeal, as recorded in Acts iii. 19—"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," &c. Now what I would deduce in the way of corroboration to the arguments already laid down is, that if faith were to hold the prominent position in the matter of the sinner's justification before God, as the advocates of the Lutheran system would make us suppose that it possessed, namely, that faith is the formal cause, or plea for justification, &c., how can they account for it, that in the two most influential discourses ever preached—at least so far as the sanction of heaven being given in the conversion of more souls to God, than is recorded of any of the discourses ever before or since preached—how is

it to be accounted for, I say, that faith is never once mentioned in either of them? If a prominency were to be given to one, particularly to one of these two leading graces of the Spirit above another, we would say that repentance would claim the precedence.

It is just like as with ourselves—if you would take a person who had dedicated his time and talents, and these, let us say, with no common assiduity, to the medical profession; and suppose, after reaching to a certain degree of eminence in this, he were suddenly called to take a seat upon the bench, though he knew nothing of the legal profession previously; or had been called to one of the chief offices of state under his Sovereign, although never having applied his mind to anything of politics before; such positions, however high in superior dignity and emolument, yet could neither add to the happiness or advantage of the person so unexpectedly and unsuitably transferred to them. Just so it is with faith, if made to take the place of a justifier, a satisfier, or a procurer—namely as being made to appear the formal cause or plea of the sinner's justification before God—then is it made to assume a position for which it hath no fitness or qualifications whatsoever; but if kept within its own proper place, that for which it was originally designed, and every way suited by Him, the Great Teacher—at once its author and finisher—there is no grace of the Spirit more useful, more deserving of high honour and esteem than faith. As subordinate to Christ, as the servant of the Great Master, nothing can be more diligent, humble, useful, and every way praiseworthy, than true faith. True faith ever honours Christ more than any other of the graces of the Spirit; and hence its high commendation, influence, and character. It follows Christ as the shadow follows the substance, or as the magnetized needle follows the pole. The cross of Christ is faith's *polarity*. Wherever Christ is, under whatever form or illustration he is presented, faith

is sure to be present, and under a suitable form and illustration. That is, if Christ be the way, faith walks in that way ; if Christ be presented as the truth, faith believes in, and adheres to him as the truth ; is Christ the life, faith lives on, and is sustained by him as the life. Again : is Christ represented as the Bread of life, faith feeds on him as such ; is Christ the prophet, faith sits at his feet, and learns in all meekness and humility of him the words of eternal life, &c. ; is Christ the priest, faith acknowledges the all-sufficiency of his sacrifice, and believes in him for the remission of sins ; is Christ the king, faith acknowledges him in this his high office of pre-eminence, and lets him rule over all his subdued affections, as Lord of the ascendant, with the sceptre of his grace. And thus of other representations, as they may be given of Christ in the Scriptures. As some person has pointedly remarked, faith cleaves to Christ as the limpet does to the rock ; which so adheres to it, that as you try to detach it, the little animal puts forth its many fibres, and holds to it with greater tenacity than ever ; so that oft-times you must smash its shell, and deprive it of its life, before you will be able to remove it. Just so it has been with the faith of many of our noble martyrs and confessors of old, who clung to Christ as the great Rock of Ages, with such power of spiritual apprehension, that they refused to be severed from him, the Author of all their high hopes and joys, preferring to die in his cause rather than deny him.

Such is the honour that faith pays to Christ, when it is allowed to remain in the position marked out for it by the Spirit in the work of the sinner's justification before God : namely, when it is allowed to act as a revealer, a receiver, a testifier ; but by no means to usurp the position of a justifier, a satisfier, or a procurer, &c. When kept within these prescribed bounds, no master was ever served by a more diligent, a more persevering, or a more conscientiously attentive

servant, than Christ by faith. And moreover, another characteristic that peculiarly attaches itself to true faith is, that whilst thus—"Not slothful in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord"—that whilst so industrious in its vocation, yet there is no grace of the Spirit so completely humble, so unselfish, so wishing to hide itself from all admiration and commendation as faith. Faith blots out, as respects itself or any of its performances, the term *meritorious* from its vocabulary. However commended by others, or even by the Lord Jesus, its great Master himself, the idea of self-approbation, self-esteem, and praise, are unknown to it. True faith, like that sweet and beautifully modest flower, called the lily of the valley, courts and loves the shade, and moreover blooms and blossoms best there. True faith may be compared to that peculiarly nervous and susceptible production, called "the sensitive plant," which, as soon as you approach to touch it with any thing like familiarity or approbation, will shrink back from all attention and observation. Or, like that little animal called the box-snail, which, as on the summer's day it may come forth from its shell to obtain the vivifying heat and light of the sun, puts forth its long and tender feelers before it, in order to preserve it from all rude contact and intrusion; just so, true faith will not permit itself to be brought into contact with the rough and loud acclamations of worldly honour and applause. It seeks the honour that comes from God only, and finds its highest glory in bringing forward to the front of the stage for all high and holy praise, Him whom it sets forward as its sole great idol for all admiration, love, and adoration, the Lord Jesus Christ, its great Author and Finisher—the only Saviour and Redeemer—even God over all, blessed for ever and ever. Amen.

There are some spirits amongst men peculiarly adapted to take precedence and command; there are some among men born essentially for rule and

authority; take, for example, the Wellingtons and the Nelsons, &c., in the things of war; in politics, the Pitts, Peels, &c.: so there are persons born amongst us fitted rather to serve and to obey. Thus, to use a very homely illustration, in drawing a distinction between the Scotch Protestants and the Irish Romanists, the inhabitants of the north of Ireland were accustomed to use a common proverb, taken from the shoes they wore—viz., that the former made the best upper leathers, and the latter the best sole or under leathers. Yes, there was that sturdy feeling of independence amongst the Scotch breed of the Protestant part of the population in the north of Ireland, that quite unfitted them, generally speaking, however poor or reduced by untoward circumstances in the fluctuations permitted here by an all-wise and an all-directing Providence, for the servile occupations of life; whereas, the Romanist used to fall into such, and fill up these niches of society, as by natural instinct and desire. Hence, in passing, we may observe, that there is no part of the emigrating population amongst us that seem to get a more ready access, or to succeed better amongst our great transatlantic western brethren, than do the poor Celtic, Romish females; forasmuch as they make the best servants of all work there. But should any master or mistress be so happy as to obtain one of the real old Cameronian breed of Scotch Presbyterians to become one of their household, and to attach themselves, through love or gratitude, to their persons and establishment, such master or mistress may look upon their fortune, so to speak, so far made; they have got a treasure amongst them, such as neither gold nor silver can purchase; they procured not so much an useful servant—a sagacious domestic—but rather a well-trying faithful friend*—a friend the more and

* Note H.

longer tried, the more faithful to be found; so that that noble character given of the Roman senator of old, may well receive a second edition, even "You may as well try to turn the sun from its course as such from that of honour, of truth, of integrity, and every virtue." Now, it is in the spiritual world as in the natural world; and so we find Christ born to be the "leader and commander" of his people, and faith born with a certain aptitude and fitness to be his liege servant. And again: as you cannot invert the order of things as above arranged and disposed of by the God of all prudence and counsel, without bringing a proportionable damage upon society; so neither can theologians pervert or derange the qualified positions of Christ and faith, without the greatest possible detriment to religion.

And so in proportion as faith honours Christ, Christ is ready to honour faith, by using it for many most important employments in the work of the salvation of his redeemed people. Thus faith is used, under Christ, as the great instrument for receiving and appropriating the promises; for instance, according to the power of that text—"Blessed is she that believeth, for there shall be a performance of those things that were spoken to her of the Lord;" or, again, that text in Eph. i. 13—"In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." According to the language here used, faith would seem to have the same honour, in a certain subordinate sense, put upon it by its Master, the great King of kings, as a great officer of state, who is called the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, has. Or faith rather comes, in the way of evidence, as the precursor to the Christian's mind, proving thereby that

he has been sealed or stamped as being of the goods or property of heaven.

Again: faith has the honour put upon it, to be employed, under Christ, as the great life-preserver of the redeemed in him. For just as the God of nature gives to us, his creatures, natural existence, but employs, under himself, several agencies which he has ordained as instruments for preserving and keeping up, in proper healthfulness and increasing vigour, the existence originally communicated by himself; so, in the world of grace, God originally communicates spiritual life, but then uses subordinate agents for keeping it up in its proper healthfulness, energy, &c. Now, faith, under Christ, is the principal subordinate agent for this purpose. For as God uses the air and the lungs, the heart-blood circulation, the unctuous marrow streaming from the head, and so of other active elements, for the preservation of actual natural existence; so faith is said in the Scriptures to perform one and all these offices, and many more that need not be named, for the upholding of spiritual life. Thus—*e.g.*, faith is the spiritual air which we breathe, and the spiritual lungs through which the process of respiration is to go forward; so that without the exercise of a continual act of faith, we are like a person in the natural world who would be placed for a while in an exhausted receiver, where death must soon be the consequence, unless speedily released; (compare Gal. ii. 20, 1 John v. 10, 12, John i. 3, 5, &c.) and so of other resemblances, which would be too tedious to enter upon.

Again: faith, under the agency of the Holy Spirit, has been honoured by Christ, to be the great sanctifier for Christians. Thus—*e.g.*, faith is said to “work by love,” to “purify the heart,” and to “overcome the world;” and to be “sanctified by faith” is as much the declaration of the Scriptures, (see Acts xxvi. 18,) as to be “justified by faith.”

Again : faith has been honoured by Christ under the agency of the Holy Ghost as a great comforter to his people. Thus, for instance, in Romans v. 1, we read —“Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through Jesus Christ.” And here, by the way, I would remark the very illative or inferential particle “therefore,” at the commencement of this text, proves to demonstration that the view which I have given, under this heading of faith, is the proper, Scriptural one ; for, the illative particle being here used, shows the connection with the verse of the chapter which went before ; but this last verse of the fourth chapter, comprehends the two leading doctrines of the redemption in Christ, as I have already proved, and which form the great ground work of my theme throughout this work—namely, the vicarious sufferings of Christ, and our vicarious justification in him. And thus faith being honoured under Christ, to console the Christian amidst the trials and uncertainties of this perplexing, sinful world, we are hereby, as the apostle states downward in the connection of his argument, enabled to “glory in tribulations” also. And here I would remark a double result accruing ; first, that as faith enables the Christian, by setting future glory against present sufferings, to bear up with peace and joy against the trials and temptations which flesh is heir to ; so, secondly, the more such trials and temptations abound, the more a blessed reflect influence becomes exercised thereby upon faith itself ; for, like as the smith by beating constantly on his anvil, and as the carpenter by plying laboriously the various tools of his trade, have the sinews of their arms thrown forth into more brawny and muscular development ; so, the more faith becomes exercised in supporting the Christian under his afflictions, and the more these afflictions are made to abound, the more faith itself, being thus habitually exercised, becomes strengthened and made perfect. (Compare Jas. i. 2, 3 ; 1 Peter i. 7. 8, &c.)

But as all the above offices of faith will come under my notice more immediately in my next work, (as being practical,) I shall not here enlarge more than to make one observation, which is, that since faith has such a variety of important engagements to perform in the experience of the Christian—such as are more than equal, humanly speaking, to occupy its whole time and attention—surely it seems preposterous and unreasonable to ask it to take up an additional position of labour and of work, such as those divines, against whose system I am here pleading, would make it to assume, in the matter of the sinner's justification before God—an occupation for which it has no one quality, or character, or fitness, though possessing all fitness for those offices above touched upon, and for which Providence has given to it every aptitude and suitableness.

I would press the Latin proverb—"Ne quid nimis"—i.e., we should not ask faith to do too much at once. We should not put upon it a burden such as it is not able to bear. We should not make it the servant of all work. We should not take it out of its proper place. We should be more than satisfied with that which it has been assigned to do for us. If we can only get it to perform these parts well, we may consider ourselves blessed indeed; and more especially, so far as it is the instrument designed by Providence to lay hold on Christ, as our great peace-maker with God. Faith comes up here, in this respect, as our perfect confidence, assurance, trust, &c.; and to quote all the passages of Scripture which reveal themselves to us thus in the way of the very richest and most sustaining consolation, would, indeed, be a work beyond all bounds of proper consideration. Let one text suffice, from Isaiah xxvi. 3, 4—"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee. Trust ye in the LORD for ever; for in the LORD JEHOVAH is everlasting strength." In a word, let us keep faith in its proper position, for

service under Christ, and we shall ever find it our most staid, and ready, and best friend ; and more especially in the day of adversity ; amidst all the cares and anxieties, the temptations, the sorrows, and the buffetings of this hollow and uncertain world, it will come to us with such abounding peace and joy, by realizing before our minds the solid realities of the bright scene of eternal happiness, as shall enable us, in our Christian deportment—in the serene tranquility of our undisturbed minds—to exemplify the portraiture of him, “all whose serious thoughts” were said to have been “in heaven ;” according to that metaphor which Dr. Johnston, the greatest critic in his day, declared to be the sublimest metaphor in the English language—

“As some tall cliff, which lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and mid-way leaves the storm,
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head.”

Yes ; true faith will allow the Christian ever to realize the apostolic aphorism—“sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ;” or, again, that twice-repeated, but most blessed of all admonitions—“Rejoice always in the Lord ; and again I say, rejoice.”

V.—I shall lay down seven canons of interpretation, deduced from the writings of St. Paul, by which I shall test the correctness or non-correctness of the two systems here discussed. These seven canons, or rules of interpretation, I derive (to use a scientific expression) as so many *corollaries*, or consequences, drawn in the way of easy and readily deducible questions from the line of explanation given of the doctrine by the apostle, in the remarkable epistle to the Romans, all along here commented on. To borrow an illustration from mathematics ; there is a well-known and popular problem, by which we are called upon to demonstrate the correctness of a certain, defined centre by passing the circle through a number of given points ; thus, I

would say, that the centre of truth can now be ascertained by discovering which of the two systems shall be able to pass easily through the seven points of interpretation now to be proposed.

The first canon of interpretation refers to the definition given by the apostle of that which is to justify the sinner before God. This he explains according to a variety of terms, calling it—*e.g.*, “the righteousness of God,” “the righteousness without the law,” “the righteousness without works,” &c. That the system I maintain shows itself to be the centre of truth by passing readily through the above point, must at once appear by the course of argument set forth in the first section of this work, and to which I refer my readers.

The justifying righteousness therein advocated—I might rather say therein demonstrated—being grounded on the doctrine of substitution, and, therefore, no personal pleading or appearance being at all required at the bar of this tribunal, therefore, the righteousness depended upon must, *bona fide*, be (according to the definition above) the righteousness of God, being the righteousness of Christ, (God manifest in the flesh,) who has pleaded in the sinner’s place as his moral representative or advocate with the Father. Hence, moreover, it is a righteousness truly “without the law and without works,” having nothing of human performance whatsoever mixed up with it; whereas, on the contrary, those who advocate the necessity of faith and repentance, as being essential to be brought (even after ever so limited an amount) into account for the formal or primary justification of sinners before God, are driven thereby into a corner of difficulty, by trying to make out that, notwithstanding such terms being required, they propose a righteousness without works, &c., as being that which they depend on for acceptance with God for justification. Hence the invention of such metaphysical distinctions as, that although “Faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread,

and the fear of God to be found in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying"—metaphysical distinctions and subterfuges of language, altogether unworthy of God who, when by his Spirit inspiring the writers (more especially of the New Testament) to communicate his will respecting such leading doctrine as that now under discussion, would prompt them to use words according to their plain and obvious sense, so that, to use the language of Scripture itself, "A wayfaring man, though a fool, (though uneducated, &c.,) cannot err therein." And thus, when we read such words as "righteousness without the law, and without works;" such plain terms ought to be supposed to involve no difficulty of meaning in them, but to be interpreted according to the common parlance or usage of language, and not to have required volume after volume of abstruse and over-refined theology to be written on that which "he that runneth may read;" and yet, after all such multiplied annotations, "only darkening counsel by words without knowledge," and so far from clearing up that which, like an axiom, or self-evident proposition, required no elucidation, involving it all in the most laboured and inexplicable confusion.

The second canon of interpretation that I bring forward is deduced from Romans iii. 24, and proves that the righteousness that is to justify us before God, must be one involving the point of unconditional freeness—"Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." That the system I maintain shows itself to be the centre of truth, by passing readily through this point also, must appear obvious, from the circumstance, that no personal pleading being demanded for the primary justification, therefore no conditions whatsoever are required; whereas it remains with the advocates of the system I here oppose, to show with what consistency they attempt to prove, how the perfect freeness of justification can be asserted

with such shackling requirements as faith and repentance, and which, notwithstanding all the ingenuity, sophistry, and talent, from all quarters, variously put forth, I declare they have never been able to demonstrate.

The third canon of interpretation I deduce from Romans iii. 26, and by this Scripture it appears that the righteousness that is to justify the sinner before God, must be such as shall exhibit him a *just* God as well as a Saviour—"That he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Now, pleading merely the righteousness of Christ for justification, which righteousness alone can satisfy the demands of infinite justice, it requires no argument to show how easily the system I here hold up, is proved thus also to be the centre of truth, by passing as readily through this point as through the other two just explained: whereas, those who advocate the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, must find it impossible to show how the faith and repentance, that they demand as adjuncts to the work of primary justification before God, can prove him to be, so far forth, a just God; when, according to the language of true Gospel humility, they are bound to declare, that faith and repentance, however perfect, or however simplified, cannot bear the severity of God's justice, any more than the other graces of the Spirit.

The fourth canon of interpretation, I derive from Romans iii. 27, and according to this, the righteousness that is to justify the sinner, must be such as shall exclude every thing of glorying before God—"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law?—of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." That the mode of fontal or primary justification, in this work laid down, will stand the test of this rule also, is plain, from the consideration, that it being effected without man's appearing in the transaction, all ground of boasting becomes thereby removed;

whereas, by the Lutheran system, faith being introduced as the formal plea, &c., and therefore, man being required to make a personal appearance, a foundation is thereby laid for glorying in the faith that justifies. Neither will it be of avail to assert, that faith, when so engaged, differs from a work of legal performance, and becomes an act of the mind, so abstract as to be worthy of no recognition in the case—that it shuts itself up, so as to be altogether hidden in him, whom after all it declares to be the only meritorious cause for justification before God—or, lastly, it is so humble and unostentatious a grace, that it wishes itself not to be once named, as in any wise deserving of the least praise, excellence, boasting, &c.

Just as the fabled harpies of old, used to come and pollute with their obscene claws the richly-prepared banquets, so let faith, or anything of man, get entrance here, it will go to mar and to destroy the whole feast of Gospel grace and mercy, however richly and profusely spread forth for all poor sinners otherwise to partake of. For let faith be lessened down, even to the most naked meaning of Sandemanian interpretation, still so far forth it goes to break up the unconditional freeness of the plan of salvation, and lays a foundation for glorying in the flesh. Faith, indeed, will advance forward, previously to its being allowed such above entrance, with the most loud and specious promises, that it means nought of the above accusations laid to its charge—that it desires not, whatsoever, to interfere with “the things freely given to us of God in Christ”—that it wishes not to exalt itself in the least in the matter of the sinner’s justification, but to give the whole glory to the doctrine of free grace; and to let Christ appear as every thing, and itself as nothing. Still, I say, with all such seeming fair speeches, the experiment is not to be tried; though at first small, through fear, yet soon it will acquire strength as it goes forward.

As a person who would come with the purpose of rifling, or taking possession unlawfully of the goods of another, and who, knowing that he could not effect his purpose by open plunder and violence, would therefore try to compass his object by stratagem and fraud; who consequently putting on a mask of hypocrisy, would surreptitiously endeavour to work upon the feelings of the master of the establishment, by assuming the appearance of great modesty and diffidence, so as to throw himself upon the compassion and charity of the proprietor, would seek merely for the allowance of one of the out-door premises, or the very lowliest in-door position, until by degrees establishing himself in the unsuspecting confidence of the family, in a closer intimacy and a higher ascendancy, at length takes the opportunity treacherously to perform the evil deed which he had all along in view. Or, like those of Rome, who cringingly rapping, under false pretences, at the door of the British Legislature, came imploring that certain of what they termed severe restrictions might be done away with; and most solemnly declaring, that if such their desires were granted, they would feel themselves ever after bound under the weightiest obligations—that they would henceforth remain quite contented—that all they wanted was to have the penal laws that had been enacted against themselves removed; but that they sought for no infringement of the Protestant Constitution of England in Church or State, and had no intention of plotting against the property of the one, or of the liberty of the other. Well! Britain believed them true and honest in their assertions, granted them what it thought was but a reasonable and fair request; and so, scarcely had Rome got what it called this its bondage removed, than another and another demand for further privileges was so boldly and importunately demanded, that concession after concession unfortunately was granted, until it has been almost too

late discovered, that nothing short of the actual possession of England's crown will satisfy Rome's grasping and usurping pretensions. That I am not passing too severe a censure or libel against what faith has been made to do by the advocates of the system which I have been all along opposing—by introducing the above illustrations to point out the gradually undermining work that has been carried forward, until faith, notwithstanding all its seeming simplicity, honesty, and humility, has taken possession of that position which by no means, in the original design of Providence, belonged to it, and for which it hath no suitable fitness or qualification whatsoever, and that, moreover, by having driven the real owner from his place—must at once appear, I think, to every candid and fair judgment, by the statement given by the bishop of what faith does in the matter of the sinner's justification before God—a statement that I have quoted again and again in this work; but still a statement not too often quoted, when we take into consideration, either the high reputation of the writer, or the fearfully unscriptural assertion which he has so gravely and authoritatively therein set forth:—“It is,” the Bishop says, “very expressly, and in a very great variety of forms asserted, that in the matter of justification before God, faith is by his gracious appointment counted for obedience; that it restores us to that state of favour and acceptance with him, in which the perfect righteousness of his law would have sustained us, had we been able to have attained to that righteousness, and to have preserved it.” (Page 60.)

If such be not the language of usurpation, if it doth not lay the very widest ground for faith boasting before God, I do not know what the meaning of words can be. Hence Luther, when pushed so hard as to be required to tell what it is that gives to faith, above any other of the graces of the Spirit, its quali-

fying power for justifying the sinner before God, seems to get into a passion, and calls all such questionings "the cursed (to give the term—"damnetur"—the mildest translation) gloss of sophists."

The fifth canon of interpretation to be drawn, as a deducible question from Paul's line of reasoning upon the doctrine now in question, is to be found in Romans iii. 28—"Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." From this verse we deduce, that the righteousness which is to justify, is that which is to reveal itself to faith—(see Rom. i. 17)—not to faith *alone*, but to faith with all its accompanying graces, even if they should reach to the very "complex of Christianity," (see 2 Peter i. 5, 8,) so much the better, as such would make faith come up as a clearer and stronger evidence in our favour. (See 1 John v. 10.) And again, "without the deeds of the law;" that is not, "without the fruits of faith," as our opponents would testify, but without the appearance or intervention of man at all in the case. (See my paraphrase, Note G.) But as these points contain the whole jet of the controversy between us, such as has been carried out in argument through this work, to this argument I must refer my readers, in order to let them decide which system, as passing through the above point, is thereby proved to have the centre of truth coinciding with it.

I derive my sixth canon of interpretation from Romans iv. 3, wherein it is said that "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." By this Scripture it would appear, that the faith which is to reveal the righteousness that is to justify the sinner before God, must be something similar to that which obtained from God the high commendation given to Abraham for his faith. But as I have already reasoned, whatever may have been the subject-matter of Abraham's faith, the apostle,

if we read down the chapter from the twenty-third to the twenty-fifth verse, leaves believers, under the Christian dispensation, without any doubt or hesitancy what should be the subject-matter of their faith, if they are to obtain like commendation for it from God: "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Now, every person who agrees with the interpretation that I have given of the last clause of the twenty-fifth verse, namely,—that it involves the doctrine of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ—must come to the conclusion at once, that the system that I in this work have advocated, contains, according to the above canon of interpretation, the only centre of truth.

The seventh canon of interpretation will be found in Romans iv. 16—"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace"—combined with Romans xi. 6—"And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace," &c., &c. From these texts we deduce that the righteousness which is to justify the sinner before God is to be so revealed to faith, as to appear altogether of grace without any work of man; and, therefore, his faith is not to be brought up before the cognizance of God for such purpose. But this canon of interpretation Lutheran divines will not admit; forasmuch as they state, on the contrary, that faith must be brought up as the formal plea and cause of the sinner's justification before God; whereas according to the system I have, in this work, laid down, man not being allowed to plead in his own person at all for justification at the divine tribunal; but another, even Christ, having pleaded with his most perfect, sinless, satisfactory righteousness, as his advocate with the Father; hence the whole here is of grace, and of grace alone.

Such are some of the canons of interpretation which I have thought fit to bring forward as specimens, from amongst many others, which might be deduced from Paul's line of argument upon this most vital of all subjects, even the sinner's justification before God. These will suggest themselves to the mind of every astute and deep-thinking reader ; and I therefore think it unnecessary to remark, that I have sedulously avoided bringing forward those canons, which might be derived from the doctrine of the fœderal headship of Christ, as contained in the latter part of the fifth chapter, as well as those connected with the doctrines of the divine predestination and election, as found in Romans viii. 29-32, and some of the following chapters, for the specific cause that, as all such doctrines are industriously left out by Lutheran divines, upon their reasonings in this matter, I deemed it irrelevant to advert to them here, although I could have shown, by doing so, how strongly they would have come up towards helping to give a firmer and a clearer demonstration to the subject in question.

Such are the canons (if I may be allowed an innocent play on the word) which I would direct with steady, point-blank, and, I trust, under divine agency, destructive aim, at the fortress of error but too long erected amongst us. Canons far different from those large, and unwieldy, and unmanageable, (unmanageable from their very number—141,) ones introduced by the Church of England to defend and keep up the outward bulwarks of her constitution in the land ; canons, bad as to material, being, as we may say, “ of the earth, earthy ; ” and, therefore, perishable as to their composition ; canons of worse construction and workmanship, being altogether of human invention and conformation ; canons, therefore, long since disused, being worn out, obsolete, and, as to all practical purposes, utterly useless ; canons which, to use the witty remark of a certain person, we may best denominate as so many *spiked*

guns. Not so the park of spiritual artillery which I here bring forward, and would propose to be used with the most ready and active operation; the engines that I would now substitute in the place of those of the construction of man, are such as have been cast, so to speak, in the foundry of heaven, and are made of that substance which, after the heavens and earth are passed away, shall still be found undecayed and undecaying, being as durable as eternity itself—being formed of the pure and unerring truth of God. Yes, the weapons of our warfare, I can truly say, are “not carnal, but spiritual;” and, therefore, they are, and ever must be, mighty through God, to the pulling down of those strong-holds of heresy, which the great enemy of our salvation has been too generally and indefatigably raising up all around us. The only difficulty I fear to encounter, (and that, humanly speaking, I acknowledge to be a very great one,) is the want of hands to work the engines of heavenly conformation and material, so happily and readily provided for our use, in order to give them the full advantage of all their weighty power and influence. Would that the God of all mercy might so touch the understanding and affections of the good and talented bishop, whose system I have been here animadverting upon, as to dispose him, with many of his brethren on the bench, with the long train of evangelical clergymen, who would be sure to follow in their wake, to come up at once, and simultaneously, “to the help of the Lord against the mighty.” Then, with the powerful co-operation of such a large fine corps of evangelical clergy—each and all of them “valiant for the truth”—under the agency of such episcopal guidance and generalship, might we expect the following double blessing to ensue:—First, not only that the high ramparts of superstition and of darkness, so formidably built up around us, would be, comparatively speaking, laid prostrate; but then, secondly, should we see the walls of our spiritual Zion

so strengthened, and so nobly manned, that they would at once afford an opportunity and an encouragement to large masses of the people to seek for refuge and protection within the strong-holds of the city of our God, then to be seen so extensively and so impregnably erected amongst us. Yes, to drop metaphor, then our bishops and other clergy, being no longer shackled with the creed of Lutheran Arminianism, but holding forth boldly and unanimously, the pure Gospel of free grace before the people, might we, under the divine benediction, look for a great revival in the land, and conversions on all sides, to take place. Then bishops and pastors, being made free with the perfect law of liberty, in their own souls, would find the greatest desire, encouragement, and delight in proclaiming from the house-top, so to speak, the glorious message of spiritual emancipation throughout the length and breadth of the country. Then indeed, the national Church, being thus purged from all the old leaven of Pharisaism and self-righteousness, would be established as a blessing amongst us; then "enlarging the place of her tent, and stretching forth the curtains of her habitation—then lengthening her cords, and strengthening her stakes—she would break forth on the right hand and on the left;" for then, doubtless, numbers would flock to her standard, being ready to call her the "blessed of the Lord:" then, if I may use the language in the way of accommodation, she would be as "life from the dead" amongst us; then shall take place the "shaking of the dry bones," &c.; then truly our national Church might be said to "carry the ark of the Lord;" then, exalting Christ in her confessions and public ministrations, would she, (according to the promise given by the Lord, that those who honour him, he will honour,) be exalted in turn by her larger congregations and assemblies of the saints; then, in fine, possessing that "righteousness that exalteth a nation" before Jehovah, we might hope that "God would bless us, and the

earth would give forth her increase; and that thus, by throwing the shield of the divine protection around our coasts, our national Church would come up in the way of munition against the invasion of all foreign foes, to be better to England than the stalwart strength of her Saxon warriors, or the nautical skill and prowess of her brave admirals and sailors. One prayer shall conclude the present head—May the Lord hasten in his time the consummation so devoutly to be wished for.

VI.—I now propose to give four illustrations, chiefly taken from the Scriptures, for the purpose of explaining the particular view of justification by faith, which I propose to substitute in the place of justification by faith *only*.

I use the word “chiefly” in the above heading advisedly; for although I shall draw my illustrations from Scripture, yet it must be with a certain understood proviso, that I must be allowed to accommodate them to subserve the purpose I have more immediately in hand—that is, I purpose to make such alterations in the Scriptures which I produce, as shall be found necessary to bear out more especially the leading fundamental doctrine of the total and radical corruption of man by nature.

The first illustration that I propose to take as an example will be found in Num. xxi. 6–9. I take this example as being one of the most familiar and best known in the Word, and as being symbolical of the elevation of Christ upon the Cross for the salvation of his redeemed people. Now, let us suppose that those whom the fiery serpents bit, had not only such a mortal wound inflicted on them, as would, if not cured, terminate in death; but that also those who were so bitten were, moreover, rendered thereby *blind*.

Suppose that God, wishing to rescue a certain number of those who were thus bitten, bestowed,

P

miraculously, the power of vision on such, and also induced their minds, at the same time, to look up to the serpent of brass upon the pole. Well, I ask, first, could the persons so rescued boast that they were so saved, because of their looking up to the serpent on the pole? Most certainly not, forasmuch as that in the divine mind or counsel they had been saved before the power of vision was communicated to them. As far as God was concerned, their looking up to the serpent could not be said to be either the proximate or the remote cause of their rescue. It will be said, then, that such must be regarded as the *instrumental* cause of their rescue, forasmuch as, according to the commandment of God, they would not be cured unless they looked up to the serpent on the pole. No, I cannot admit of such a conclusion; I cannot allow anything done, by those bitten, to be mentioned as a cause, either proximate, remote, or instrumental, or in any other sense whatsoever, for their cure *before God*; since that had been determined upon in the divine mind long before, for reasons only known to infinite intelligence itself. And my reasoning here will find great corroboration when it is considered, that there is no connection whatsoever between the command enjoined by God, and the cure so graciously effected. That command seemed to be, on the part of Deity, a mere arbitrary* enactment, and that for the three following reasons:—First, that God might have effected a cure by any other means he might have assigned, or without any means whatsoever; and, secondly, its arbitrariness will appear more distinctly prominent, if we take into consideration that which some physicians have testified to on the matter; that so far from being an instrument for effecting a cure on persons labouring under the bite of a serpent, looking on anything of brass is supposed to be prejudicial;

* Note I.

thirdly, that there is an instinctive horror in the minds of persons so affected, of coming into contact with brass. That, as for all persons labouring under the bite of a mad dog, *hydrophobia* ensues—that is, they have an instinctive horror of coming upon water; so in this latter case, a *halecophobia*, (if I may use the expression,) or an instinctive horror of so much as looking upon *brass*, is the consequence.

I may be asked, since I admit of none of the above reasons, as it was necessary that the persons bitten should look upon the pole before they could be cured, what was the object, on the part of Deity, for such an injunction? Simply, I answer, that although in no sense the persons looking up, and so complying with the injunction, can properly be stated, as any cause why God should save them; yet the injunction was wisely and graciously demanded on account of the reflect influence the obedience to it, would have upon the minds of the afflicted persons themselves. What reflect influence? First, their finding themselves instantaneously cured by looking up to the brazen serpent on the pole, would be the instrument of bringing the *sense* of this most gracious and ready salvation to their *own* minds, and thus beget in them, not only great joy at their sudden rescue, but would fill their minds with gratitude to their great deliverer, and this, more especially, if they could discover no argument why the hand of grace and mercy had been put upon them more than on those of their fellow-sinners, whose blanched bones lay scattered on the burning sands of the desert. And, finally, the following would appear to be a great practical benefit to result from the command given:—If, as is generally supposed, the brazen serpent, on the uplifted pole, was carried ever afterwards by the Israelites in their devious wanderings in the wilderness, and was so placed that every morning, when they would rise from their beds, the first object, on going forth from their tents, uplifted for their eyes

to look upon, was this object by which such a wondrous cure had been effected; they would thus have a kind of memoritor, or portable sermon, preached to them on the morning of every day.

The application of the whole seems so ready and plain, that it would be almost superfluous to make it, but for the general, I might have said, almost universal misapprehension of the doctrine which I have in this work laid down, and the great prejudice which I know will be raised against the reception of it. As for the original passage in the Scriptures, we have an application made of it by Christ himself, as the infallible interpreter of the Word—"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." But now, as to my interpretation of it, with the change which I have made in it, and which change I made, in order to let the passage coincide with the doctrine of the total and radical corruption of man by nature—a doctrine essential to be introduced, in order to bear out the demonstration of the doctrine I have in view. As mankind have been bitten with the fatal bite of him who is called the "Old Serpent," and in consequence of such infliction they are exposed, not only eventually to death, but, in the meanwhile, to that *moral blindness*, under the influence of which each of us has become judicially affected. But God, to use the language of Article seventeen, "having, before the foundations of the world were laid, constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he had chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour," &c.—*miraculously*, as I may say, bestows upon such the power of spiritual vision, by which they are enabled to look unto Christ upon the Cross, as the brazen serpent, for their spiritual cure. But God, not only communicates to those, who

are to be saved, faith, as the spiritual eye, being “the evidence of things not seen,” and also being “the gift of God ;” but as, according to the tenth Article, “the condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn or prepare himself by his natural strength ;” so God not only bestows the essential grace of faith, but also *inclines* those, to whom he has given it, to use it for the purpose set forth in the passage now under consideration. Well, then, I ask, what is the use of faith in this matter? or why has this great gift of heaven been thus so graciously bestowed? Is it that faith being so possessed, and being used according to the divine command above expressed, should thereby be supposed to form, either the proximate or remote cause of the salvation of believers? By no means ; for this salvation has been effected for them in the divine counsels, according to the language of the article above quoted—“before the foundations of the world.” Is faith, then, to be considered as the instrumental means of procuring such salvation? No ; and for the express cause above asserted. The exercise of faith, however perfect in its kind, and obedient to the divine enactment, can never be brought forward, as making, in anywise, the ground of a formal plea with God, why he should save any of his creatures. The only thing that God’s mind can rest on with satisfaction here is the precious blood-shedding of his Son, as forming the alone atonement to infinite justice. And it was by reason of an anticipatory promise on Christ’s part, in the fulness of time, to undertake thus for his people, that the purpose of God, according to divine election and predestination, to save any out of the fallen mass of mankind, could have been determined.

Well, then, the point at issue comes to this—I shall be asked whether any of the adult part of mankind can be saved without obeying the command given in John iii. 14, 15? I answer, no. I shall be asked

what interpretation do I put to words so express as those in verse 15—"That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life"? My answer is plain and ready; surely the words here so expressly uttered, with corresponding ones throughout the New Testament in general, can bear the exposition, without having recourse to that of imparting to the plan of salvation, so often and reiteratedly told to us, as being free and of grace alone, such shackling conditions as would break up the harmony of the Scriptures on this essential point, and thus deprive the believer of that item in the doctrine which is so rich to him in all peace, and consolation, and confidence in the complete mercy of his God in Christ. Can we not, for instance, taking the definition given by Paul of faith in Romans i. 17, bring it to our advantage and support in the disentangling of this, to many a mind, involved and difficult question? St. Paul declares, in the text referred to, that he was "not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," because "therein is the righteousness of God *revealed* from faith to faith." Let us then bring the privileged office here assigned to faith, to bear upon the interpretation of John iii. 15, and the whole appears at once of the very easiest solution. The office-work assigned to faith then is, that it reveals to the believer's *own* mind, the *sense* that he is one of the saved, or of the elect people of God. Faith is no evidence to the mind of God, why he should save any person; but it is the very best evidence, under God's Spirit, to convey to our own minds the most blessed conviction that we are the saved in Christ. It can never be made an argument to testify to God that the possessor of it should, by consequence of his obedient use of it, be saved by him, forasmuch as it is his own express donation, communicated to those alone whom he had previously determined to save, and to whom, moreover, he gave the power "to will and to do of his good pleasure." According to the Article, God can alone

incline the mind of any Christian to the right exercise and obedience of faith ; without which divine inclination communicated, man has no natural strength of his own to use this grace, or any other donation of heaven, properly. But faith, according to John v. 10, comes in the way of the most blessed testimony to a man's own soul, that his name is among those who have been "written in the Lamb's Book of Life before the foundation of the world," and thereby becomes the medium of infusing into his soul the peace of God, even that "peace which passeth all understanding"—that peace which the world can neither give nor take away ; thereby, again, the love of God—that is, the manifestation of God's love to us sinners—becomes "shed abroad" in his heart "by the Holy Ghost which is given" to him ; and so the principle is laid for the most grateful homage unto God, and thus faith becomes essential for all sanctifying and practical purposes whatsoever. "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself."

Such are some of the offices assigned to faith—offices quite sufficient to occupy its fullest attention, and afford it the highest prerogative for all practical services, without requiring it to encumber itself with other duties, for the performance of which it hath, humanly speaking, neither time, opportunity, or any fitness, or any suitable qualification. When, for instance, the answer was given to the affrighted jailor of Philippi, to his soul-agonizing question, what he should do to be saved?—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," &c.—surely it was never intended, by the expression, to have it conveyed to the mind of the Church of Christ, in all future ages, that the faith exercised on this occasion by the jailor and his household, was to be considered as a warranty before the mind of God why they should, on this account, be the saved by him. No ; their faith might be a warranty to their own minds why they should think that they were the saved or accepted

of the Lord in Christ; and that it was so, appears evident from that which is stated in the thirty-fourth verse, wherein we are told, that "he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house;" but it could be no warranty why God should save them, inasmuch as they could not be possessed of this power of believing in Christ at all, unless God, predetermining to save them, had communicated to them this, the great gift of heaven, and also had directed their minds, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, to make use of faith after a proper manner. After the same mode of argument must the testimony of St. Paul, as given in Acts xiii. 39, be interpreted—"And by Jesus all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Here, likewise, faith is not introduced as a condition or reason why God should justify those that believe, but it is introduced as a condition or reason, to the souls of the believers, why they should obtain hereby a satisfactory evidence to themselves that they were thus justified before God, and that, consequently, they might have all peace and joy in believing, and every other blessed practical result that flows forth from the exercise of such obedient faith.

Another Scriptural illustration which will serve my purpose here, is taken from Judges xii. 4-6, in which the Ephraimites, who were to escape the sword of Jephthah, were obliged to pronounce the word shibboleth. Now, in order to let the illustration include, among other subjects, the doctrine of man's corruption by nature, which doctrine it is essential to have prominently stated, to make out my argument; let us suppose, I say, the Ephraimites were dumb, so that, physically, they could not pronounce the required word, but that God, having intended to save a certain number from out of the general mass, would bestow upon those, miraculously, the sudden power of speech, and would incline their hearts to use their speech, so as to pronounce the given sound—could the Ephraimites that were saved

under such circumstances, in any fairness of argument, boast that they were rescued because of their having pronounced the shibboleth? Could their having done so, be declared to be the cause, proximate or remote, why God should save them under such circumstances? Could such be declared to be even an instrumental means for their deliverance from the sword of destruction? No; surely not; for as far as God was concerned, the enactment of pronouncing the given word was altogether arbitrary on his part—that is, I mean, having determined to save a certain number, he could have appointed the using of the given shibboleth, or any other means he desired, or could have saved them without the use of any means whatsoever. As regarded God, the Ephraimites using the word or not, could not go to inform the divine mind why they should be rescued above the rest, who were left for destruction. Nay; the language of humility would suggest to the Ephraimites the ascription of their safety altogether to the divine grace and mercy. They would be ready to say, “Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name be the praise, O Lord;” forasmuch as they should remember that originally (according to the supposition which I have made, of their being born deaf and dumb—a supposition, be it understood, I have introduced, not for the purpose of tampering with the Word of God, but merely to suit the history to meet the doctrine of grace, for which purpose I bring it forward in the way of accommodation) they were incapable of uttering the shibboleth without the divine aid miraculously bestowed upon them, and also without their hearts being influenced to use it according to the required obedience.

The history of the Ephraimites, with its allowed alterations, like that of the brazen serpent, comes forward, for ready application, to illustrate the subject in hand. For all mankind, by virtue of the fall in Adam, being born spiritually deaf, as to any power or inclina-

tion to hear the words of eternal life, and spiritually dumb, as to the giving utterance to any Gospel sound, are hereby rendered morally incapable of making use of the shibboleth of salvation for their own rescue from destruction, until the God of grace may come down miraculously to interpose for the redemption of those whom he chooses, according to his own electing counsels, to separate as "vessels made unto honour," &c. (See Article 17.) They who were thus predestinated to eternal salvation, having their ears spiritually bored, now listen to the voice of the charmer, captivating them with the ravishing sounds of heaven's free pardon, and great and plenteous redemption; now are they endowed with that great donation of heaven, even true and spiritual faith, by which they are enabled to pronounce the real shibboleth—to call "Jesus, the Lord, by the power of the Holy Ghost."

Now, I ask, can the possession of such a faith, and their using of it aright, be properly said, with any fair show of right and logical reasoning, to be the cause, proximate or remote, with God why he should save them? Were not such, as far as Deity was considered, saved long before the gift of faith was communicated to them? Nor can we say that the exercise of faith, however comparatively perfect and obedient it may be, can be stated, as we argued in the case of the Ephraimites above, to be in anywise an instrumental means, or any means whatsoever—say, in the shape of formal plea, or cause, or any other designated term that may be used—of their salvation. Such acts affect not the mind of Deity in the matter at all. The introduction of faith, and its use in the sinner's justification, has been altogether an arbitrary enactment on the part of God, so far (I mean to say) as to informing his mind as to who, when, or how, any out of mankind are to be redeemed; as the language of Scripture goes, "Known unto God are all things from the beginning;" and again, "The Lord knoweth them that are his."

The promised seed, saved "according to the election of grace," were all before the broad mind of Omniscience (to use the language of Article 17) before the foundations of the world were laid." It is with God as with a sovereign amongst ourselves. Suppose a section of the dominions of the latter, say a province, or part of a province, had got into a state of rebellion, and a certain number of the rebels being taken in arms, tried, and convicted, the sovereign, according to his prerogative, wishing to exercise mercy, might select from amongst a large number a certain few, and let the law take its effect on the rest: just so with God in this case. All mankind standing before him as so many convicted rebels, he selects, from age to age, those whom he wishes to make the monuments of his grace; or, to use the language of the Article, he delivers "from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation," &c. The only difference between the two cases here, (and that, to be sure, a very great one,) is, that the earthly sovereign may and will, no doubt, sometimes select the objects for the exercise of his mercy, according to caprice and partiality; but God selects those whom he chooses out of mankind, according to the dictates of infinite "*wisdom and prudence*." (See Eph. i. 8, 9.) He condescends, indeed, to tell no man of his reasons for such election. "His counsel" here is "*secret to us*."

This, the great covenant of grace, was arranged between the three great Persons of the Deity among themselves in eternity, by which the Second Person, having anticipatorily promised to perform, in the fulness of time, that work whereby the divine justice would be honoured, had then a certain seed promised to him, which would satisfy him for the travail of his soul, &c. Here, then, is *alone*, that which the divine mind can rest on with complacency, even the finished

work of Christ's great and mysterious atonement. God wants not man's faith, or any thing of man's performance, or his personal appearance at all, to add to the perfect satisfaction which he has received from the Son's completed redemption. Every thing else introduced afterwards, towards accomplishing man's final salvation, must be considered, as far as the number of the redeemed is to be taken into account, as perfectly arbitrary on the part of Deity—arbitrary, I mean, as far as assigning any reason as to the number of rescued may be concerned, or why any whosoever out of mankind should be saved. Faith, nor the exercise of it, however complete with all its blessed practical results, can do nothing in any-wise here. Christ's perfected engagement has accomplished all this. The interpositions of faith must be for some other design; even that which I have laid down already in my argument on this point to be its legitimate use, and alone office-undertaking, and to which argument, to avoid tedium, I now refer my readers.

Another Scripture which I select to illustrate my argument respecting the doctrine of free grace, or the doctrine that I have all along strenuously pleaded for, even that of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ, will be found written in Ezek. ix. 1-7. In this paragraph, God desires the "man clothed with linen, and with the writer's ink-horn by his side, to go and set a mark upon the foreheads of them that were crying for the abominations that were being done in Jerusalem, in order that they might be separated from the rest of the inhabitants, who were devoted to destruction. Now if we leave out the qualifying clause, denoting the character of those selected from among the multitude for preservation, the rest of the history will come up in the way of a ready and a happy illustration, to strengthen my demonstration of a subject which I have been desirous

to prove and to substantiate. And here, through fear of misapprehension, I wish once more to repeat, that in any of the alterations I propose to make in these Scriptures, it is by no means for the purpose of taking an ungracious liberty with the Word of God, or from any desire of changing the meaning of the original passages, as they stand in the sacred text. I would not wilfully alter one line or word of Scripture. I use the passages upon the present occasion, not so much as quotations from the Scriptures, as that they are so many well-known and familiar facts—facts better known, and more familiar, than those that might be derived from uninspired and more remote history—facts which I can therefore use with the greater ease and advantage, for accommodating illustrations for my general readers. I feel, therefore, no hesitation, with this explanation given, to change the different portions here advanced, in any manner that may suit the object I have in view in bringing such forward. I propose, then, respecting the present paragraph, to leave out the qualifying clause in the fourth verse—an alteration I suggest, like those I have previously made, in order to square it with the fundamental doctrine of the radical corruption of man by nature; and more especially, as we have that doctrine so plainly and so broadly stated in the New Testament Scriptures, particularly in the Epistle from which I have derived my demonstration upon the subject under consideration. Whatever may be the difference as to moral character and attainment between men, as they stand forth the constituted members of society, how much soever one man may exceed his fellow-man in upholding morally and respectably the conventional laws of order and decorum, as they stand forth before God for justification, all such distinctions become equalized and levelled; or as St. Paul states the doctrine in Romans iii. 22, 23—
“There is no difference; for all have sinned, and

come short of the glory of God." Omitting, then, the qualification in the fourth verse, for the reason above assigned, the fact recorded in Ezek. ix. 1-7, corroborates, in the way of illustration, my reasoning all along here sustained, concerning the part or position which faith holds in the matter of justification. Indeed the imagery used by the Prophet, is nearly word for word the same as what we find transferred to the New Testament, in the symbolic book of the Revelation. Compare vii. 3, with xiv. 1.

Supposing, then, according to the alteration as to the qualifying clause of the fourth verse being omitted, God desired the man with the writer's ink-horn to go and set the mark on the foreheads of a certain number from amongst the rest of the inhabitants of the doomed city, to be spared, without assigning any reason why they should be saved beyond their companions that were left to come under the judicial vengeance of heaven, have we not thus a case to be identified with those spoken of in the passage above referred to, or with the case of believers in general in the New Testament? and all which cases, when they are properly and deeply weighed, bear me out in my argument regarding the sinner's primary justification by substitution, and the non-intervention of faith, &c., in the matter. For, to come to the case which meets us in the above passage, surely those that might be rescued on the terms above prescribed, could not in any wise ascribe their preservation to the mark put in their foreheads, but must refer all to the selecting power and will of heaven; so it must be likewise with those of whom it is said, they were sealed with the name of their Father written on their foreheads. And if it be asked, for what purpose, then, was the marking made by him that had the writer's ink-horn? I answer at once, not by any means to inform the mind of God who they were that had been intended for rescue, inasmuch as that if

God had not previously fore-ordained them for salvation, they had never had the distinguishing and saving mark set upon their foreheads. The mark, then, was given, in order to inform the minds of the persons themselves that they were reserved in the councils of mercy from destruction; and it was set, moreover, thus in so prominent a part of their bodies, that they might have hereby a standing memorial before their eyes, how they were indebted to the divine interposition after the manner of free grace, and of free grace alone, for their deliverance; and that consequently their minds should be filled perpetually with adoring gratitude for mercies so undeservedly and so electingly dealt out to them, and thus to consecrate their future lives in active and devoted services to Him who had redeemed them from the judicial wrath which lighted on their fellow-sinners, as little guilty originally as themselves.

And thus, the whole parable, with the interpretation thereof as now given, seems to apply so obviously to the case of believers under the present dispensation, as scarcely to need any further comment. For, to revert back to those symbolically represented, as having their Father's name written in their foreheads, whatever may be meant by such an expression—and I suppose it may be identified with the sealing of "the Holy Spirit of promise, as the earnest of the believer's inheritance, until the day of the purchased possession," (Ephes. i. 13, 14,)—whatever, I say, may be meant by the above symbolic language, whether it be faith as the great donation of heaven, or the gift of the Spirit with all its most blessed peace-giving, sanctifying influences—(see Rev. xiv. 1-5, &c.)—not one or all these attainments, the sealing, &c., included, can be brought as witnesses before the mind of God, why Christ should set apart any person whatsoever for justification before himself. For, in the first place, if we compare the passages Rev. xiv. 1 and vii. 3,

connected with the sealing of the servants of God in their foreheads, and which (as I enter not here into the prophetic bearing of the words) I shall identify with the saved Church of Christ, we find that the mysterious doctrine of the Seventeenth Article comes up again and again into play in these, the latter chapters of the Apocalypse. Thus, for instance, if we turn to the fourteenth chapter, eighth verse, we find it predicted of the members of the true Church of Christ, that they are those whose "names were written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world." (Compare Rev. xx. 15, 21, 27, &c. &c.) In these, and corresponding passages, we have the deep truth revealed to us, that all that were to be saved in all ages of the Church, were known by name to God and the Christ from the beginning. It would seem that a double satisfaction was required, to be fulfilled by two great Personages in the blessed Trinity. The Father required perfect satisfaction to be fulfilled, to meet the demands of his infinite justice for the sins of those creatures which his omniscience foresaw they would commit; and the Son required satisfaction to be fulfilled for the travail of his soul, to be offered up as the expiation to offended justice. This council of peace took place between them from eternity. In consequence of it, the second Person condescended to come forward in a comparatively subordinate official character as the *Christ-head*.* In this character, he became the Creator of all things. (See John xi. 3.) In this character, in the fulness of time, he took upon him human nature, and became the Redeemer of his Church. The only difficulty here—and no doubt it is to us a very great and incomprehensible one—is, why the Christ-head should have, according to the popular view of the subject,

* See Note K.

so small a proportion out of the redeemed mass of mankind, as his elect and saved people? Why, when he entered into compromise with the Father, he did not drive (as men call it) a harder bargain? Why, when he was seeking satisfaction for the travail of his soul, he did not use more comprehensive terms; and more especially, when we look through the spirit of prophecy, we find he was not straitened on the part of the Father. That the Son had only to open his mouth wide in the way of petition, and the Father was ready to grant to the fullest extent of his desires, according to the promise given in Psalm ii. 8—"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the *heathen* for thine inheritance, and the *uttermost* parts of the earth for thy possession." And we are told that Christ, the great Philanthropist—the great lover of the human race—was *satisfied* with the compact he entered into with the Father. He saw and knew the seed that was promised to him. He had all their names written in his book, before the foundation of the world. Christ engaged in no chance medley enterprise. He knew what he was about to do—the redemption price he was about to pay—the invaluable amount of it. He did not wish to shed his blood for nought. He looked for a complete equivalent; and yet to him, who was the very personification of all grace, mercy, and loving-kindness, must we still put the question—when viewing mankind through the medium of the faith, repentance, and spiritual regeneration required of all true believers—"Lord, are there few that be saved?" Acknowledging our total insufficiency to solve the arcana of the divine mind here, I would say to my readers what I say to myself, with regard to those deep things that belong unto God—Wait awhile—"Let patience have its perfect work"—stay yourselves, till you reach to that state of future perfection, "when we shall know even as we are known!" In the meanwhile, let us take up the language of humility, and declare that

we are but as yesterday, and know nothing; *i.e.* we know nothing perfectly, essentially—we know not the *essence* of the smallest crumb that falls from the table, or the veriest atom that swims in the sunbeam: how then can we, “by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea.”

Take the little animalcula: put it on the thick part of my arm; it would take, say, the whole duration of its existence, to span the circuit of it. What conception could its tiny brain, supposing it could be possessed of any, have, then, of the proportions of my whole body—of its various articulations and joints—its wondrous and complex anatomy? Much less can it form the very remotest conception of the mechanism of the human mind, the variety of its talents, and the outgoings of its multiplied undertakings, genius, &c. Now, between finite and finite, there may exist something like a degree of comparison; but what degree of comparison can be instituted between finite intelligence—let that intelligence be carried out even by the most sweeping compass of the intellect of an archangel—and the infinite mind, that pervades all space, maintains, governs, and rules through all things? Verily, verily, we cannot spell out the very plainest letters that are written on the lowest base; how then can we think of deciphering the mystic characters that crown the summit of the sublime column of truth?

We cannot do better, to shut up the digression into which we have been inadvertently led, than by quoting the words of the apostle, when summing up his conclusion upon the same mysterious subject of the divine decrees, “Oh! the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who

hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen." (Rom. xi. 33-36.) Truly this earth, with all the histories of its myriad myriad inhabitants, and its few thousand years duration of time cut out *parenthetically*, so to speak, from the ocean of eternity that on all sides surrounds it, forms but an infinitesimal speck in the boundless span of the creation of Omnipotence.*

To return now to my argument. Seeing, then, that we cannot discharge out of our system the doctrine of the divine fore-knowledge, how can we suppose that faith, repentance, or any of their blessed facts or principles, or any thing of man's presence or performance, can be brought up directly or indirectly—proximately, remotely, instrumentally,—or in any wise or way whatsoever, to communicate the intelligence to the infinite understanding of Deity, whom out of mankind It is to select for justification and redemption in Christ? Doth it not seem not merely presumptuous in the extreme, but puerile also, to talk of man's faith, &c., being proposed as the formal plea or cause of his justification before God? No; we must away with all such vain, proud, Arminian, Lutheran hypotheses for ever. We stand upon our defence before God here, by delegation alone. Christ has been the Church's representative with the Father. The doctrine of substitution, or that of the sinner's vicarious justification in Christ alone, meets the necessity of the case.

But secondly, it will be now stated, (Rom. i. 17,) that "the just shall live by faith." This text stands in connexion with the declaration of the apostle as to the use which faith is, in the matter of the sinner's

* Note L.

SECTION II.

ification, viz.—that it is the instrument whereby righteousness of God—even the righteousness of God manifest in the flesh;” that is, the righteousness which alone is to justify us before God—becomes revealed to the soul of the sinner. But it may be asked, what I deduce in favour of my argument from the text, “The just shall live by faith”? I answer, that it shows up faith as being used under Christ in another, and that a secondary, office, undertaking, and duty. But what office is this? The meaning I annex to this Scripture is simply as follows:—To explain it I draw an analogy from the course of nature—i.e., as God communicates to us natural life, and then has ordained several means whereby this life, in regular healthfulness and order, is to be supported; so, in the spiritual world, God gives to his elect people spiritual existence, and then has appointed regular means, instrumentally, for its support likewise. As no person can attribute his natural life to anything in himself, but must acknowledge God to be the sole author of it; so, respecting spiritual life, he must attribute its origin to the divine agency alone. And thus, in the passage under consideration, the just (or the justified) having originally obtained spiritual existence from the God of all grace, faith is brought in as the leading instrument whereby it is to be sustained. Faith, as I intimated in a former part of my work, may be considered, or rather illustrated, by the air which we breathe into our natural lungs, as well as the lungs themselves (according to a double simile) through which the air is breathed. So Paul has it in Gal. ii. 20—“I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, *I live by the faith* of the Son of God,” &c. Here, then, I may close this subject; and the argument which I draw from the whole is as follows:—namely, that faith has nothing at all to say to the procuring of justification, which, in Rom. v. 18, is termed

“justification *unto life*.” This justification unto life must originate with God alone. Faith is not used here even as an instrument, but it is the great and main agency to be used in keeping up spiritual life, imparted to the soul of the believer by free grace alone. And just as faith is in lively exercise within us; so this life of Christ in the soul comes up to full vigour and healthfulness, and will exhibit itself in all fruitful outgoings of righteousness, to the praise and glory of God the Father, &c. The conclusion comes to this—that we work, not *for* life, but *from* life. The former is according to the Arminian system, or hypothesis; the latter accords with the Calvinistic system, or hypothesis. I leave to my readers which system, according to the arguments and analogy above introduced, is the true one.

As I borrowed the three former illustrations from the Old Testament Scriptures, I shall borrow my fourth and last one from the language of the New Testament Scriptures. Moreover, I find I cannot get one more suited to my mind than that which is connected with the very title of this part of the divine inspiration. Suppose, then, that a very wealthy nobleman, dying, writes down a certain young person as his heir in his will, putting him under a certain wise and conscientious guardian until he gets possession of his estates and titles. Now, what would such a wise and conscientious guardian do, respecting a minor put, according to such circumstances, under his wardship and care? His first and principal concern would be, doubtless, to provide him with such a system of education as would be suited to the high rank and station which, under Providence, he was called to fill; forasmuch as every wise and prudent person must know that without such a finished course of education and instruction, the mind being left to the untutored feelings and propensities of nature, would be quite incapable of managing such large possessions and honours, either with happi-

ness and comfort to himself, or dignity and advantage to others. Just so the parable applies. Christ is the great testator who has written down his elect Church to be heirs of all his highest dignities and unsearchable riches. But Christ has taken care to place his elect Church—being, as long as it has to do with the present dispensation, in a state of pupilage or minority, (see Gal. iv. 1-7)—under the control and discipline of the very wisest and most blessed guardianship. The Holy Ghost is the spiritual guardian of the elect Church, under Christ; and the Holy Ghost, as such, exercises his office—undertaking after the manner described above—that is, he brings the members of it, from age to age, into the school opened out, so to speak, at the foot of the cross; and thus takes care to have his young novitiates and wards trained up in “the way in which they should go.” There are two elementary parts of Christian instruction, more especially, that the Holy Spirit desires to have the true disciples of Christ properly educated in. These are what Paul said he took care to teach those unto whom he was sent as the spiritual apostle of the Lord, and which he declares to be the whole counsel of God; (that is, no question, the whole counsel, so far as being considered the foundation upon which the rest of the counsel of God, as a superstructure, might be built up;) these were, “repentance towards God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ.” Now, what is the meaning of these expressions? And, first, of repentance towards God? I cannot admit repentance to have, in this passage, nor in those passages in Acts ii. 38, and iii. 19, the meaning commonly ascribed to it; such as, for instance, by the bishop. (p. 45 of his work, and p. 114 of the present work, to which I direct my readers.) For, however important such definitions of faith may be in their proper place, yet I cannot but conceive that great damage has been done to the Church of Christ by attributing such to repentance in the passages referred to; indeed, in doing

so, we take the word out of its proper contextual bearing, and thus mar the spirit of the apostolic application of it. But to come to the point—what is the meaning that I would annex to repentance in the above passages, contrary to the usual acceptance of the word? It is necessary that we should consider the character of the congregations, whom the apostles were addressing. Now, these were altogether Jews, and not a mixed congregation of Jew and Gentile; as the apostles had no warranty to offer the Gospel message as yet to the latter. (Compare Luke xxiv. 47, and Acts xiii. 46.) In summing up evidence, then, Peter, in his two most remarkable discourses, with the word "*repent*," and Paul, in the passage now under consideration, it would seem as though it were used with a most proper pertinence and peculiar emphasis. The original word means a complete change of mind, and with St. Paul's paraphrase of it—"repentance towards God"—it would be as though the apostles desired their hearers to give way, as to all their Jewish ideas, as to the character of God, and to look upon God under a new aspect altogether. Now, what was the particular aspect and character with which the Jew looked upon God? Under the Mosaic covenant, God appeared as the "righteous Judge" and rigid Lawgiver; but under the Christian economy God presents himself under a very different view or denomination, even under that most endearing appellation, the "Father of mercies" in Christ, or as the "God of love." When, therefore, St. Paul preached repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and thereby testified that he shunned not to declare unto his people "the whole counsel of God," he meant that counsel whereby God became reconciled to his people "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" and he, therefore, with Peter, addressed a Jewish audience to cast off from their minds all severe notions of Deity, as being a Judge

ready to take vengeance on their iniquities, and to look upon him as the God that had got his whole reconciliation for all the sins of his people, in the finished work of satisfaction or atonement in Christ. In a word, the doctrine here preached by the apostles, properly and contextually understood, would be no other than that which I have been here advocating, even that of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ; telling their hearers that God was propitiated with regard to them—that they had nothing to do in this respect whatsoever—that every thing had been done here “*ab extra*,” or out from all their own, or any human performances—that Christ had completed the work of redemption, and that henceforth they might look upon themselves as “complete, or accepted in Him.” In fact, it was preaching to them that doctrine which Paul more distinctly announced afterwards to the Corinthian Church, when he expressly asserted that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.” That, therefore, there was no difficulty, on the part of God, as regarded the work of reconciliation, but that the only difficulty lay on their own part—viz., that they should become “reconciled to God,” by laying aside their carnal enmity, and ceasing to look upon him as they (the Jews) were hitherto accustomed to do, either as the frowning Judge, or the severe Legislator, “reaping where he had not sown, and gathering where he had not strawed.”

Some such-like views I maintain to be comprehended in the reiterated admonition of Peter, when he calls upon his hearers to repent, and of Paul, in his address to the Ephesians, when he declares to them, as we have already noticed, that he shunned not to declare unto them “the whole counsel of God; testifying” unto them “repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.”*

* Note M.

Such, then, are the two elementary principles of Christian doctrine, in which the Holy Ghost sedulously instructs those who are put, from age to age, under his protection and guardianship by Jesus Christ, as the great heirs of those splendid inheritances which he has purchased for, and bequeathed to his elect and to be saved Church. And here we come at once to the position which faith is to have under Christ for all true Christians. Faith is imparted to them with repentance, as above explained, as of the very essence of that education which is intended to render them capable of enjoying their future great honour and property, or to render them "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light."

For you might as well expect the untutored boor, from the bogs or mountains, to feel happiness and pleasure, by being suddenly transported to the saloons of royalty; or to be able to conduct himself with propriety, gracefulness, and ease amidst the highly polished circles of the refined, the elegant, the wise, the learned, and the great, as to expect a Christian, uninstructed in the faith and repentance of the Gospel, to find bliss and satisfaction, if suddenly removed to the paradise of God above. He could find no zest or taste for any company he would meet there. He could not partake of, or have a relish in any of their pure and hallowed exercises of gratitude and devotion. Their holy and rapturous plaudits would have no responsive echo in his breast. He would be like the animal out of its proper element; and, therefore, everything of death, rather than of life, would be, in some measure, the sensation produced.

Such is the highly honourable and privileged position which faith holds in the economy of the Gospel under Christ. It forms a famous adjunct towards permitting believers to come up with the power of a suitable finish or education, to enjoy with comfort, and to support with dignity and ease, the great rank

unctuously and without difficulty, to move it through the many otherwise inextricable wards of the sacred truths in the Scriptures, as to unlock the hidden treasures, variously and abundantly stored therein, that hereby we get our souls enriched for time and for eternity, with all the unsearchable riches of Christ. Whereas respecting any other key that may be brought to bear here, however ingeniously devised and wrought up such key may be—call it Lutheran, Arminian, or by whatever denomination you may term it—I would put one and all under the same category of false keys, and then would apply to them the language used by the *Christian Observer*, vol. 6, p. 504, to Dr. Taylor's, of Norwich's (Arian) commentary on the epistle to the Romans, and which he styles his "Admirable Key," and upon which the writer, in the *Observer*, makes the following remarks, which I here transcribe literally and verbally from Archbishop Magee's work on the Atonement, they being so very pertinent, (vol. 2, p. 345,)—"The key of this author is not, I am persuaded, the legitimate one. I should rather be tempted to resemble it to some of those false keys, vulgarly called picklocks. The web of the key, to speak technically, is, in those ingenious instruments, cut to so slender a form, as is consistent with the strength necessary for turning the bolt, in order that the chance of the impediment from the wards may be as little as possible. But the lock, with which this theological adventurer had to do, was of such a peculiar construction, as to resist every effort to open it, except with the true key. The Doctor gave some desperate wrenches, and doubtless imagined that he had effected his purpose, when he found the key turn in his hand. But it has been discovered by others, that he did no more than break it in the lock, and the bolt, for anything that he has done to remove it, remains where it was before."

VII.—I shall answer some objections which will

naturally arise from the substitution of the new system here laid down.

The first objection I shall reply to shall relate to Luther himself. And here three questions meet me. First, what my opinion of Luther is? Secondly, how I can account for the anomaly—how a person so strangely deceived, as I have conceived Luther to have been, and that not on a common, but on a fundamental doctrine of religion, that he should be employed by God, notwithstanding, as the chief instrument—the noble champion for bringing about the great and glorious Reformation? And, thirdly, how I can account for the still apparently stranger contradiction, how God could have allowed him to impose his false view—as false I have here all along contended it to be—so upon the collective theological wisdom of his day, as to permit them to stereotype this error upon posterity, by having introduced it among the creeds and confessions of the various existing Protestant Churches? I shall reply to these three questions as briefly as perspicuity will permit. And now as regards the first question :—There is no person that can hold in higher esteem the general character of the great reformer, than the present writer does. I venerate Luther, not only on account of his bold and intrepid bearing—his dauntless, lion-like moral courage; (even that which made him cry out, “ though there were as many devils in Worms as there are tiles upon the houses, I, Martin Luther, will go there ;” and which caused the noble epitaph to be engraven on his tombstone—“ Here lie the remains of one who never feared the face of man ;”) his uncompromising honesty ; his rare, unselfish disinterestedness, but still, more especially, his fervent piety, his Christian devotion, and notwithstanding the outward rough edges, if not, betimes, the indulgence of too severe, I had almost said ferocious invective and abuse ; (truly he was the unpolished diamond ;) his child-like humility, not to

speak of the many social virtues of the man, which any person reading D'Aubigne's history of the Reformation, must at once discover. Truly, in reading the full-length portraiture of this great person, as given by the graphic pen of the above writer, I can say, that I am not only ready to revere, but to love the memory of Luther. As to the second question, as above stated, to be answered, I would reply, that it is not for us to limit the operations of the Almighty, by attempting to dictate to him what kind of instruments he may be graciously inclined to use to bring about, even his vastest designs. We know, from fact, that he compassed the remarkable modern revival of religion, and more especially in breaking up the dead calm and apostasy (as I may call it) of the national Church, instrumentally, by persons holding the most opposed and discordant sentiments—viz., by George Whitfield and his followers, the high Calvinists of their day; and by John Wesley and his followers, the low Arminians. But, again, God allows some of those distinguished men, whom he sets in various ways, measures, and places above their fellows, to fall into some of the grossest blunders and inconsistencies of error, to prevent their admirers from going out in the way of adoration after their idol; or he gives them some "thorn in the flesh," to keep them humble, and to prevent them thus from going out after too great an admiration of themselves. And again, though I would not desire to pluck a single laurel from the well-earned crown that has been placed on his head with so much praise, and though I give him credit for all the good motives and intentions which actuated him throughout his noble and disinterested undertaking—though I am ready to acknowledge, in the language of Mr. Newman, (*Lectures on Justification*, p. 25,) that "Luther's wish was first to extirpate all notions of human merit; and, secondly, to give peace and satisfaction to the troubled conscience,"—yet we must ever

remember the gross and corrupting darkness of the Church from which he so lately emerged, and how hard—yea, impossible—humanly speaking, it would be for a person to come, *ad saltum*, or all at once, to the full and clear light of Gospel truth—persons, generally speaking, “seeing men as trees walking.” It is difficult for a man to reside long in a city with the plague, and not be inoculated somewhat with the taint of its fatal corruption; so Luther, coming forth from Rome, had somewhat of Rome’s Pharisaism and legality still cleaving to him. And this brings to my remembrance the saying of a learned doctor of divinity—that “he never knew any convert from Romanism, however, high in talent, and eloquent in discourse, who had his mind so completely purified, as not to have a portion of the slime of the old superstition still adhering to it; that whilst many were most clever in negatively exposing the error, few, if any, he found equally clever, positively, in seizing upon, and appreciating the truth. They were most famous for knocking down, but not so famous for building up.”

With regard to the third question to be answered, as laid down above—namely, how Luther could have got his system, not only transfused into the minds of such a host of eminent theologians, but transfused, moreover, into the creeds and confessions of faith of so many of the Protestant Churches—I remark, that there are some persons born, as we say, with such master-spirits, as to give the tone and direction to the whole age in which they live. Now, Luther, from the peculiar qualities of his mind, already succinctly described, as well as others that might easily be enumerated, was highly calculated to be such an one. Again, Luther having lived so long under the meridian of Rome, when he became the leader of the opposite party, brought a little of the spirit of the Vatican with him; and, whilst denouncing most strongly the usurpations of one Pope, with the inconsistency and

weakness of fallen human nature, set himself up as a kind of rival Pope amongst his Protestant brethren: consequently, whatever peculiar opinion came strongly before his mind, he was accustomed to give it forth so oracularly, and with such a weight of authoritative boldness, as to force into acquiescence his more timid associates, and make them to comply with his arbitrary dicta with as much readiness as if they were part of the divine testimony itself. This remark bears with peculiar force, as respects the comparatively nervous and wavering temperaments of our good Archbishop Cranmer, (and to whom, as the great leader of the English Reformation, I wish, at present, to limit my observation,) over whom Luther seems to have ruled, with such a predominant sway, as to have made him embody in the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England, his favourite tenet, which he termed, so far as it might be prominently set forth, or kept back, the doctrine of a standing or falling Church. In a word, Luther seems to possess that peculiarity of spirit and of temper, which enabled him to dragoon, as the term is, his fellow-labourers in the Reformation into the reception of those peculiar views which he himself, no doubt, thought were the truth, but which I have now endeavoured, in this work, to show to be unscriptural and untenable.

Another objection, and the most formidable I have to reply to is, how that I, not only a member of the Church of England, but a beneficed minister in her Establishment, can, with any consistency, or show of honesty, attempt to impugn one of her Articles, and the Homilies connected with it, and yet hold to my position within the Church? My answer shall be fourfold. First—I shall fall back upon the sixth Article, which is, as I have already stated, (see pp. 168, 169,) is the salvo for all scrupulous consciences, and which neutralizes and reduces to nought every thing that may be found opposed to the Scriptures in

the Articles, the Homilies, and the Ritual of the Church, as it declares—"That whatsoever is not read in the holy Scriptures, nor can be proved thereby, is not required of any persons to be believed as necessary to salvation." Now, I do not find the Lutheran theorem of justification by faith *only* in the holy Scriptures; neither can I see how it can be proved thereby; neither do Romans iii. 28, nor Gal. ii. 20, avail my opponents in anywise: (see note G.) indeed, James argues, that a man seeking to be justified by faith only, would be thereby seeking to be justified by a *dead*, and not by a living faith. (See James ii. 14-26.) And how Cranmer, who drew up the homily on salvation, (as well as the eleventh Article,) could have been induced to compose such sentences, so void of all common sense and meaning, of which the following is but a specimen, (there being many such throughout the homily on salvation,) only proves the truth of the Latin proverb, that—"alequando dormitat Homerus"—and that no man is perfect; and, therefore, the wisdom of the Scriptural command—"Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils." The sentence of the homily I allude to is the well-known and oft-quoted one—"And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; it shutteth them out from the office of justifying." Truly faith, thus stript of all its accompanying graces and virtues, and still supposed to be alive, resembles an Englishman—once a fine, ruddy, Saxon-faced youth—a parishioner of mine formerly—a groom to a neighbouring gentleman, and whom having missed for a few Sundays from his seat in my church, where he had been usually a very regular attendant, I went to enquire at the house concerning him. I was informed by one of his fellow-servants that he was for a fortnight in bed *wasting*. Supposing the youth to have been labouring under some fearful, and perhaps fatal

R

pleurisy, or the effects of some most violent, rapid consumption, I hastened, alarmed and agitated, to his bed-chamber, and pulling gently aside the curtains, so closely tightened in on every side, so as industriously to exclude the very smallest breath of air; I was beginning to express my sympathy at his sudden and alarming illness, when the youth soon undeceived me, and stated he was very well; but that he was trying to *waste* himself, (reiterating the jockey expression, which I had heard the first time that day in my life)—that is, to reduce himself by three or four stone, in order that he might come within the prescribed weight to run his master's horse at the next Curragh races; and verily he was likely soon to compass his end through the means of the superincumbent mountain-pressure of blankets, that then lay upon him. Truly the theorem seems not less monstrous, barbarous, and unnatural, which would show up faith, (which should *always* appear, so to speak, fair, ruddy, and well-liking amongst us,) as the poor, wan skeleton, spectre-like-looking-being, that the system of *fides sola* would represent her. Or to give a more classical illustration, and, therefore, one more likely to meet with a general acceptance, faith thus stript of all her accompanying graces by her seeming, but false friends, would appear to have that thus done to her, which the witty and facetious Lucian represents Charon, the Stygian ferry-man, making some of the burly, fat ghosts, (being the ghosts, which he describes, of the luxurious, sensual livers, whilst on the earth,) to do—namely, to lay aside all those unnecessary heavy things, such as their pride, vanity, luxury, &c., &c., as otherwise, if they were to come in with such accompaniments they would soon sink his crazy boat, with all its cargo of ghosts, to the bottom.

But, secondly, there is a direct contradiction, as I have, in my arguments throughout this, proved between the eleventh and seventeenth Articles, the eleventh

being Arminian in its tendency, and the seventeenth being Calvinistic; and, therefore, we find the strenuous proclaimers of the eleventh Article, holding an habitual reserve respecting the seventeenth Article, in their preachings, conversations, or publications. And thus, as respects the learned bishop, whose work I have been animadverting upon, (see preface,) and so indeed of all the rest of the high Church party, of whom Mr. Macaulay, in the third volume of his history just published, gives the following testimony:—"The great party, which had been peculiarly zealous for the Anglican polity and ritual, has always leaned strongly towards Arminianism, and has, therefore, never been much attached to a confession of faith framed by the Reformers who, on questions of metaphysical divinity, generally agree with Calvin. One of the characteristic marks of that party, is the disposition which it has always shown to appeal on points of dogmatic theology to the Liturgy which was derived from Rome, rather than to the Articles and Homilies, which were derived from Geneva." (See Vol. 3, pp. 93, 94.) And thus, in accordance with the above remark, I hear that a notable Archbishop of the Church, is going about with what we technically call a cut and dry correction of the Book of Common Prayer in his pocket, ready to present it, the first favourable opportunity he may get, before the House of Peers for acceptance; and of which amended Prayer-Book, the leaving out of the seventeenth Article is to be one of the principal features. As for Luther himself, the great introducer of the Arminian eleventh Article, it is notorious, either that he disbelieved the doctrines of the divine predestination and election, or at all events he discarded them from holding any part in his publicly professed creed. But I have shown throughout the general bearing of the present volume, that the doctrine of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ is

identified with the Seventeenth Article; and as I have also demonstrated, that these two Articles stand in direct opposition, one to the other, being at perihelion and aphelion distances removed. Now the Church of England calling for general assent and consent by such subscription, puts her sons upon the horns of a dilemma. They are called upon to make a choice between two extremes. As no man can serve two masters, who may command opposite services at the same time—as no one can fight at the same time in the ranks of two opposing sovereigns; so we are called upon to make up our minds to choose whom we will here serve. To use the sentiment of Mr. Macaulay—with the ritualists, whether we would go after Arminianism, which inclines to Rome; or with the confessionists, go after Calvinism, that conducts to Geneva. We cannot be Arminians and Calvinists together.

Secondly,—In giving my assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles, &c., of the Church of England, I gave it, as I suppose every Clergyman does, with a certain degree of reservation: that is, my subscription to such would be very different to my assent and consent, if called to give it to the Word of God; for this being perfect, my subscription must be, if conscientious, unqualified. But the former, being of human composition, must have more or less the impress of humanity—even imperfection—bound up in it. To give an illustration to the point:—

Suppose a man were called upon to give his approbation to that particular position assigned to him, the residence in which he dwells, &c., he may very fairly, as a contented man, give his assent to these allotments of Providence. What would be understood by such subscription? Surely, not that they were so perfectly to his mind as that he could not discover any flaw or imperfection in them, so as not to be able to discover any better: his subscription would

go to declare his comparative satisfaction. Just so, when I gave my assent, &c., to the rituals, &c., of the Church, I did not mean that I could not discover any spots or imperfections in these, but only that I felt a perfect satisfaction with such, when comparing them with those of other churches.

Thirdly :—But again, I say, to borrow the language of St. Paul, (as far as my present view of doctrine laid down in the present work is concerned,) “I did it ignorantly in unbelief;” nor would I for any position in the Church, however high in rank, or great in emolument, give my assent and consent again, without being permitted to give my open, qualified exception against the Lutheran view of the eleventh Article, as already largely discussed.

Fourthly :—I think it honest here to declare, that I never was fully satisfied with the subscription required by the Church of England. I always thought its wording too strong, too binding, and unreserved; so much so, that but for the safety-valve opened out in the sixth Article for the high pressure of the steam of dissent to emit itself through, I am sure that it would have forced many tender consciences otherwise to have left her communion. I am one of those who feel sorry that Lord Nottingham’s Comprehension Bill was not carried in 1689. (See Macaulay, vol. iii., pp. 89-99.) I think it not only a blot, but a sin, not to have a national Church, so comprehensive in its character as to embrace within its circumference every person who loves the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. I like the aphorism of the great Augustine—“*In essentialibus unitas, in non-essentialibus diversitas, in omnibus charitas.*” For want of this spirit of comprehension, we are reduced to uphold the anomaly of having, in the same kingdom, two national Churches—viz., the Episcopal Church in England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church in Scotland; and, if report be true, it was the beau-ideal, or the perfection

of polity, with some, as they would style themselves, *sapient*, but as I think they should be rather called *infidel*, legislators, to have the Church of Rome established in Ireland, and thus have three national Churches. Hence the unwise and exorbitant concessions that have been made, from time to time, by our statesmen to Rome in Ireland, until Rome has not only gotten her vastly-increased parliamentary grant for the endowment of her own college, but is seeking an entrance also for her sons into our great Protestant university; and she has got nearly possession of the bench of Ireland, and all our fine Protestant institutions have been nearly levelled at her arbitrary dictum; and still no satisfaction, after all, is given, nor would be, if Rome had her will, whilst a single thing of Protestantism remained in the land. Concessions are all on the wrong side; and the very vocabulary of England is made to change its meaning before Rome's domineering sway amongst us; so that the very word "liberal" is now used no longer according to its original definition, to include liberty of conscience, but any person who would use his conscience to uphold the "liberty wherewith God has made us free," or to declare, so as to stereotype the truth amongst the people, must now be put down, according to the modern nomenclature, as the most illiberal person in the country.

The third and last objection that I shall answer is, that acknowledging my dissent from the doctrine of Article 11, why I continue within the pale of the Establishment? My first reply is, where am I to go, suppose I were to quit her institution to-morrow? For Bishop O'Brien, in his notes, has given to us a catalogue of upwards of a dozen confessions of faith of the Protestant Churches, in which the doctrine of justification by faith *alone* has been introduced; and as for enumerating all the names of great and venerable persons whom he, as well as other writers, have

put down as holding this peculiar dogma, it would exceed all bounds even to name them. If it be asked me, secondly, why not at once submit to such a weight of authority, and yield my judgment to the many eminent divines who have preceded me, as well as to that of those who are now living? and is it not doing violence to the right of private judgment, not to do so; not taking advantage of all liberal allowance according to the above doctrine granted, and turning all fair liberty to be, in such matters given, into licentiousness? I acknowledge the apparent justice of all such imputations, and that, "*argumentum ad verecundiam*," (see *Introduc.*, pp. 13, 14,) would seem to be here proved against me. My answer is, that however in non-essential things, (according to the above maxim of Augustine,) however elastic my conscience might prove—and here I acknowledge myself to be most liberal, so as to allow it to stretch itself to the very utmost bounds of discretion; yet, where solid, vital truth is concerned, as in the present case, I can admit of no laxity of principle whatsoever; I cannot bow to any names in such cases, however numerous, and however high in reputation for rank, talent, piety, &c. I have no alternative left. I am permitted no discretionary power in the matter. Duty commands me here to obey, at any risk, and against all opposing authority. This forms too serious a question to think of giving way to points of etiquette; the soul is at stake, and nothing in the world must be permitted to jeopardy its salvation. The command of Scripture is plain and peremptory—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." We stand not at Cæsar's judgment seat—to our own Master here, even Jesus Christ, we stand or fall.

But still, as it may be well to avoid all appearance of evil, and to show that it is not from any principle of pride, arrogance, or presumption, that I hold so tenaciously to, and so boldly and prominently bring

forward my present views, I think it right to state, by the way of exculpation, how I began first to entertain them. Many years ago, having had Bishop O'Brien's celebrated discourses put into my hands, I devoured them with the greatest greediness and delight. I, at that time, subscribed most completely and unhesitatingly to his view and argument; I thought his deductions to be most clearly drawn, and logically proved; I felt enamoured, not only with the subject-matter, but with the style and character of the whole work. I thought that I perceived the spirit of a master-mind pervading the whole; in a word, he was, in his doctrine and reasoning, my *magnus Apollo*; but afterwards, on reading the volume over a second time, I was struck with the manner in which he laboured to prove the *freeness* of justification—how he quoted multiplied texts and passages of Scripture to bear him out in his view—how he returned again and again to the subject—how the proof of it was a leading point in his mind—how he travelled out of his way to reiterate his pleadings on the question, like a person who had not been fully convinced that he had been borne out in his first conclusions; or, like as when one might have a tender point, and, therefore, be particularly nervous respecting it, so would conjure up all his sophisms and ingenuity, to the support of the vulnerable point. All this coming before my mind, I was brought to reconsideration, and a fuller investigation of the whole; and the result has been the new theorem, (new as far as my confined reading and comparatively uninformed mind, as to the theological views of others are concerned,) which I have, for the latter years, in my pulpit addresses, more or less adopted; and which I have, in the present volume, logically reasoned out, for the consideration, (would that I might hope to have said,) for the conviction, and consequent adoption of the deep-thinking Christian public. Upon the candour of that public I now throw myself, and hope to

meet from it that fair, and unprejudiced, and generous judgment, which the great weight and solemn importance of the question at issue demands; and upon this and every other occasion may it and the writer be ever more actuated towards the performance of the double work and duty—namely, to “exalt Christ, and to hide pride from man.”

VIII.—“I shall show some of the leading benefits to be derived from the system I propose, in contradistinction to the Lutheran system, now objected against.”

The first leading benefit to be derived by the adoption of the system I have here proposed, in contradistinction to that which is technically called the Lutheran system of theology is, that the former contains all Gospel for those who embrace it; whilst the latter, comparatively speaking, contains no Gospel at all. For what is Gospel? We all know Gospel, (the old Saxon word,) means good spell—*i.e.*, good news, glad tidings, &c. Now, taking our stand upon the leading doctrine throughout this work maintained and proved, as the grand fulcrum—the only solid foundation to depend upon—even “the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ”—what Gospel is here to every one who really understands the doctrine—truly appreciates it, and spiritually appropriates it! For what is good news to us, who were sin-convicted, sin-burdened culprits, if that doctrine which is contained in the above declaration be not good news? For what is the doctrine respecting such point therein propounded, but the most free, the most unqualified, the most unconditional justification that words can express? For it tells us, however vile, however double-dyed—(*i.e.*, scarlet-coloured, Isa. i. 18, which, to be perfect, must be dyed in the woof and dyed in the warp.)—that is, dyed in original corruption, and dyed in actual transgression, we might in our own natural state have been—it tells us that our sins have been all borne away

from eternity into the wilderness of forgetfulness, never to be known, recognized, or brought up in judgment against us by Him who, according to his promised anticipatory engagement in the divine council, had undertaken, in the fulness of time, to become the spiritual scape-goat for all his redeemed people. It tells us that Christ "has borne our sins in his own body on the tree." And, therefore, since Christ has borne the sins of us, his people, before we were born, therefore we have no right to be burthened in the above respect for any sin we may have committed, or may be committing, or shall hereafter commit, as far as our justification before God is concerned. Christ has (it is not said that he shall bear) "borne our sins and carried our sorrows." "He was wounded for our transgressions, and the Lord laid (mark, throughout, the past tense, and not the present or future, &c.) upon him the iniquities of us all." In a word, it tells to us that we had been pleaded for already—(i.e., from eternity, before the foundations of the world, &c.,) by Christ our spiritual representative with the Father; that the Church—i.e., the whole body of the elect, was bound up in spiritual unitism or identity with Christ, so that "as he is, so are we in this world." But Christ is now the justified, the accepted with the Father; and, therefore, as true believers, we stand justified and accepted with the Father; we have nothing to do in this matter; we cannot have anything to do in this respect; we have no personal appearance to make here; we have no accountability to render respecting our justification before God. Another has undertaken for us—one that was quite equal to the task—one who could do the things for us a thousand times better than we could have done for ourselves; we roll, therefore, all our responsibility upon Christ; we make no conscience in this matter; (see Heb. x. 2, i. 3;) we put upon his shoulders the burthen of the whole; we go completely unburthened; we are

here altogether without weight, without anxiety, without care. (compare Heb. xii. 1, with 1 Peter v. 7, &c.) "Call it phrenzy, fury, or madness, we care for no knowledge but this—that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered—that God made himself the *sin* of man, and that man is made the *righteousness* of God;" or, to borrow the language of Mr. Newman, (Lecture on Justification, pp. 25, 26,) "Christ having obeyed the law instead of us, every believer has, at once, a perfect righteousness, yet not his own; that it is not his own precludes all boasting; that it is perfect precludes all anxiety. The conscience is unladen without being puffed up." (O si sic omnia!!!) If the above be not Gospel, good news, glad tidings to every sin-sick, broken-hearted penitent, I do not know what the meaning of words can be.

Now, shifting our scene, but taking with us the blessed truth, even "the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ," and bringing the doctrine therein embraced to bear upon the character of God, what Gospel will there not be, under this particular phase of revelation, discovered to us. For what is it that this Scripture reveals to us respecting God? or in what light does it hold him up before our minds? No longer as the rigid law-giver—as the just but stern Judge "to whom vengeance belongs," but now as the Father of mercies—as he who has gotten his reconciliation to us in Christ—as a God, therefore, "passing by transgression, iniquity, and sin," in all his believing and accepted people; (and that because that he "who thought it not robbery to be equal with God," having taken upon him our sins—having become our sin-bearer—our legal-bound bondsman, the Lord did not, therefore, spare him "the guilty;")—"as a God delighting in mercy." Yes, this is Gospel also. The Gospel unfolds the true character of God—shows up what God is to his believing people, not what his believing people are to him. It declares

what is in God's big heart to us; not what is in our little heart to him. It is the manifestation of God's love to us; not of our love to God. The Gospel shows God as our covenant God in Christ, to be—according to that beautifully embracing denomination—love; and oh! what kind of love?—love flowing down pure, undefiled, everlasting, from the well-head, the originating Fountain of all hallowed blissful communication of love. But what use is there in striving after a description of that which surpasses all description and imagination, and which must be felt to be properly or at all understood?

“ Could we with ink the ocean fill,
 And were the heavens of parchment made,
 Were every stalk on earth a quill,
 And every man a scribe by trade;
 To tell the love of God above
 Would drain the ocean dry;
 Nor could the scroll contain the whole,
 Though stretched from sky to sky.”

Truly, the love of God in Christ, to us sinners, is a love “which passeth knowledge.”

Now, let us change the scene once more, and take another phase or view of the subject; but still bringing along with us the notable declaration or aphorism, namely,—“the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ.” For, as the landscape painter who would be taking views along the southern coast of Europe; whether he were engaged in his art going along Spain's southern shores, either of Granada, Mercia, Valentia, or Catalonia—Spain! once the land of chivalry and romance—or whether passing the Pyrenean boundaries, he might be traversing the southern districts of France, taking sketches by his art here and there throughout the land; or whether he were thus engaged in Italy itself, the mart of painting and of the arts; or whether he were going over the classic ground of Greece; or though last, but not least (least in extensive territory, but not

least in interest and in history) even Palestine—Emmanuel's land, as having received the foot-prints of the Redeemer on it, and as being the place where, at his glorious second Advent, he shall yet receive his grand public investiture, as King of kings and Lord of lords—wherever, I say, our painter might plant his steps—whatever beautiful combination of nature's scenery he was taking in, there would be one object, and that a very leading one, he could never leave out of his landscape pictures, however varied or multiplied they might be: the beautiful waters of the Mediterranean Sea—on account of reflecting on their calm, glassy surface, the azure hue of heaven with the golden beams of the cloudless sun—must meet in, and pervade all his pictures. After the same manner, must the doctrine of vicarious substitution accompany us in all our landscape combinations of the truth, however many and diverse as to object and scenery such may prove; and that for the same reason assigned above, namely, because that the fair face of heaven, with the warming, enlightening, golden beams of the spiritual Sun of righteousness, are ever being reflected on, and from it.

And thus, if we take this doctrine, and let it bear with all its proper influence upon the allotments of God's Providence respecting us, in this chequered scene of life, what Gospel will not be found bound up with it? For, seeing that it tells us, with all the commanding influence of the most undoubting assurance, that not only do we stand perfectly and for ever accepted in Christ, but that "as he is, so are we in this world;" that is, there is nothing which Christ in his official undertaking earned in the way of justice at the Father's hands—no dignity or high calling, nor any name—though Christ has a name in such respect above every name or rank that is named, not only on earth, but in the heavens above—but we, according to the measure of our spiritual capacity,

shall in due time be partakers of. What Gospel is not here? Truly, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," i.e. it doth not appear to the scoffing and infidel world what we be; for as the world did not know or recognise Christ's titles to his great and everlasting honours, so it will not recognise the titles of any of his servants to those similar ones that await them in the future dispensation of everlasting life and glory; but we ourselves know, that "we shall yet see him as he is, and by seeing him, shall become like him." Yes, wondrous, wondrous promise—"a truth 'twere bold to think it true, if not far bolder still to disbelieve"—yes, I say, we shall yet "see the King in his beauty," and then when "we awake up after his likeness, we shall be satisfied with it;" for he shall "change our vile bodies, and fashion them after his own glorious body," &c. Surely, here is Gospel enough to satisfy the most craving, the most naturally ambitious of the children of men, and in the meanwhile to make us contented with the stations that God may assign to us in this life.

We are reminded of the beautiful sublime stanza of our good and evangelic poet, Cowper:—

"But oh! thou bounteous Giver of all good,
Thou art of all thy gifts thyself the prime—
Give what thou wilt, without thee we are poor,
And with thee rich, take what thou wilt away."

Yes, this doctrine is what we may call the true "philosopher's stone;" it turns every thing it touches into gold. For the mind that truly has laid hold of it, which has appropriated it, and in which it really has infixed itself, can look with comparative indifference upon the changes and chances of this mortal life, not caring much for its prosperities or adversities, for its sorrows or its joys, knowing that, if an earthly sovereign be anxious to give his son, who is to succeed him in his kingdom, the best education which his kingdom affords, how much more shall our heavenly

Father train up those whom he predestinated to be heirs with Christ in his future kingdom, in the way that they should go ; and therefore he makes all things work together for their final good ;" yea, gives them grace to "glory in tribulation also." Yes, suppose the darkest cloud big with coming judgments, or the very greatest and most sudden sorrow to overtake the believer, let him only put forth the spiritual hand, and take a tenacious grasp of this great and precious truth of his "vicarious justification in Christ," then shall the glorious Sun of righteousness, immediately appearing in the opposite heavens, send forth the bright beams of his glory and effulgence, so suddenly and so penetratingly through the descending shower of judgment, that the eye of faith looking up, shall at once perceive over its head the resplendent arch of the covenant, with its emerald hue—the emblem of mercy and grace—particularly set forth and developed.

Such being some of the views of Gospel bound up in that system which I have been pleading for, there seems to me to be but little or no Gospel in the opposed Lutheran system. For as I have already shewn, that system can make no solid pretensions of holding out to its votaries any thing like an offer of free and unconditional justification, surrounded as it is with such qualifying clauses of faith and repentance ; and where can there be any solid and permanent foundation laid for peace and joy in believing, throwing its supporters for such upon the moving and unstable quagmire of their inward experiences, making them to be looking for these, *ad intra*, to what may be passing within themselves, rather than looking for such, *ab extra*, or to that which hath been already perfected, for and independently of them by Christ ; causing them to be seeking what they can be doing for their justification before God, rather than to that which God has already done thus for them in Christ—

trying to get God reconciled unto them, rather than trying to get themselves reconciled unto God—endeavouring to obtain mercy at God's hands, rather than believing that such mercy has been obtained for them already by Christ. In a word, trying to work for salvation, rather than *from* salvation. I know that the upholders of the system profess and preach loudly about the Gospel, and therefore will be ready to denounce those that deny that they do so, as passing a severe and an uncharitable censure, if not an ungracious libel, against them. I for one should be most sorry to be found doing so. But I cannot but think that the preachers of such a Gospel may be well-compared to the guardians of that most precious jewel, called the "Koh-i-noor," at the Great London Exhibition, who so managed, that those who wished to see it might look at this great diamond at a certain distance, but who used some secret and ingenious mechanism, by which, if any one should bring their hands too near to grasp it, immediately popping down, it disappeared, and some black substance was substituted in its place.

A second benefit to be derived by the adoption of the system I have here proposed, in contradiction to the Lutheran system, is, that we shall appear no longer as a church ashamed or afraid of proclaiming the whole counsel of God. We shall be no longer treating certain Gospel truths, and these, moreover, most weighty and essential ones, like many persons who may be found in the lower ranks of life, who may be seen behaving towards some aged members, who have passed the time for all useful and profitable service, with most ungracious neglect; they do not cast them out, to be sure, from their houses, to perish by the road-side, nevertheless, they all but do this; they allow them a place in their chimney-corner, and a subsistence of the very coarsest and scantiest measure, and clothing of the very merest covering; they do

not, perhaps, directly cause their death ; but still, in the last days of their existence, they are treated with such insulting contempt, that it can be easily seen by the most common observer, that should they not have hastened their dissolution, whenever such, in the course of nature, may occur, their departure, so far from being the cause of grief, will be rather one of joy and congratulation to the survivors. Not much better would appear to be the conduct of many church-men—yea, and these *high* church-men, as they anomalously style themselves—to the doctrines of the divine election and predestination. They look upon them as *effete*, or as though their time for service and for profit had gone by, if indeed they would admit they ever had a time for service or for profit; they behave towards them with the veriest scorn and insult; they cannot, thank God, deprive them of existence; but they treat them as though they never had been; they pass them by with the most ignominious silence; they cast them out, so to speak, to the moles and to the bats. In a word, the seventeenth Article of the Church is to all such, a perfect nullity, and they would wish to serve it, as a certain dignitary in the Church, whom I once knew, served the Epistles of St. Paul. In a Bible, belonging to his son, and from reading which the son had become a Calvinist in doctrine—a doctrine which this dignitary hated, with the most cordial hatred, and which, to prevent his son from further imbibing—he sewed up the Epistles, and, at the same time, took a solemn oath upon the Bible, that his son should never enter the sacred profession, (for which he had been then reading, and to which he was bending the whole powers of his mind and of his affections,) unless he gave up his peculiar views, which were denounced as being the most awful, most dangerous, and heretical. But, on the contrary, I wish to bring forth these most revered truths from the obscurity under which they have too long lain; I do not wish to give a

greater prominence than what they possess in the Word of God ; neither do I much less wish to take them out of the position which they hold therein ; I do not, for instance, wish to have them brought forward for the purpose of exciting vain jangling and endless controversy, or for calling forth worse than useless discussions on metaphysical and dogmatic theology ; but I would desire to see them used for the same purpose for which all the doctrines of the Gospel have been originally designed, even to be doctrines "according to godliness," and for all holy consolation, and every high and elevated principle.

A third leading benefit to be derived from the adoption of the new system, in place of the old or Lutheran one, would be the strengthening of our Establishment, and that after a two-fold manner. The system would act in a double capacity. It would act, first, as a bill of *comprehension* ; and, secondly, it would act as a bill of *exclusion*—that is, I mean to say, that as the Church cannot get from worldly politicians those enactments of righteousness, which would make her a praise and a blessing in the land ; as she cannot, (to keep to the particular view or subject, which I have more immediately in hand,) as she cannot get from the legislature such an act of comprehension, which those, who understand what her real interests are, would desire—that is, such an one as would embrace within her pale all the pious in the land ; nor can she get from them such a bill of exclusion as would keep far away every unworthy and ungodly person from her communion—she should take the law, as far at least as such was legal, into her own hands, and devise such tests as would be conducive to the above double purpose. Now, I say, that the substitution of the doctrine of the "vicarious justification of sinners in Christ," (in place of the objected against latter part of the eleventh Article,) would seem, in my judgment, to answer the end in view.

In the first place it would act as a bill of comprehension, for we would have all the serious, and pious, and moderate Presbyterians on our side, at least in spirit and in truth; forasmuch as all such being Calvinistic in their creed would see, at once, upon the theorem being properly and substantially brought before their minds, that it is, after all, but the practical revival of the seventeenth Article of our Church, left too long, as to any real and positive benefit, amidst dust and cobwebs, to moulder in a remote corner of the Book of Common Prayer, as altogether out of date, and out of fashion, (like many of those obsolete folios of antiquated, dogmatic theology,) on the shelves of our large public libraries; and which are allowed to remain there to fill up a niche to please the eye of the passing observer; but not to be taken down to have a single page or chapter duly read and analyzed for any practical use; nay, perhaps not until the day of the last fire which is to burn up all things on the earth here below. But, again, I would expect that this bill would embrace, and keep within the bounds of the establishment, not only all the party denominated evangelical, and these, moreover, to be drawn together by a closer bond of real Christian unity, by a holier cement of godliness, and charity, and zeal, than ever; but, likewise a large proportion of the truly humble and the spiritually-minded of the Arminian body; even those of the Methodist connection would be won over to us also, at least, by degrees, and after some interval. And I feel the more sanguine as to this latter party, (however hopeless the case, to others, may appear,) from the consideration of the view I took of the two natures, ever to be found within the true Christian, unto which account I refer back my readers to pp. 52-64. For, according to the explanation there given, I agree with Methodists as to their doctrine of sinless perfection—that is, as my readers will discover, as respects the divine nature, which, being born from above—being

begotten within us by the power of the Holy Ghost, can no more commit sin than its holy divine Parent; but the Methodists forget that there is that of Satan within the believer; and hence the emphatic saying of Christ, that "unless a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven;" the power of which remark consists, not in the statement that an unholy man would not find happiness, even if he were translated to heaven, as he would then be like the animal out of its proper element, and, therefore, everything would be inharmonious around him. Now, this is true, but it comes not up to the strong, primary meaning of Christ in the passage, which includes within it a far deeper interpretation, even the determination of Christ not to have anything to do with the reformation of the old nature, as I therein argued, and as Christ himself afterwards explained, where he says, "that which is born of flesh is flesh"—that is, it is of corruption, and that part within us must go down to corruption, and must *always* remain there; for, as the apostle argues—"flesh can never enter into the kingdom of heaven." To give an astronomical explanation of the matter: the believer has within him two forces which are always going in opposite directions. The one may be called the *centrifugal* force, which, having broken loose from God, the great centre now of his aversion and hatred, is always flying away into the very remotest, and the most undefined distance from Him, never, never to return back again. The other may be compared, on the other hand, to the *centripetal* force, which is always flying, more and more, with increasing velocity towards God, the great centre of its attraction, desire, and admiration; never to stand still, until it reaches to, and is immersed in Deity. As touching the centripetal force, it would be easy to have, respecting it, a compliance, or harmony with Methodism; but with regard to the centrifugal force we are at complete variance. Methodism agrees with what John (iii. 9) says, as

touching the Spirit within the believer—viz., that it *cannot sin*; but Methodism forgets what Paul (Rom. vii. 18) says of the flesh, that is also ever existing in the believer—viz., that it is *always sinning*. There are several evils connected with Methodism, for which the doctrine of vicarious substitution would seem to be the only efficacious cure. For instance, Methodism is of the very essence of Arminianism. It is Arminianism, as we say, *going to seed*. Hence, there is, in this respect, but a *paper wall* between it and Romanism, which it resembles in several ways. Methodism, like Romanism, seeks for a justification to be effected, rather than working from one already effected; Methodism, like Romanism, therefore, makes an inherent righteousness, rather than the external one in Christ, the formal cause of such justification. Methodism accordingly has invented what she calls the doctrine of a sinless perfection, as the qualifying righteousness for justification. Methodism, by so doing, neutralizes the doctrine of the atonement, and, so far, shakes hands also with Rome. To establish herself in this, she makes a distinction between wilful sin, and sins of surprise and accident, which, in reality, she calls no sins; and here, also, there is a verisimilitude between the dogma of mortal and venial sins of Rome. Methodism has her saints, as well as Rome, and her pictures of her saints, even the likenesses given of her preachers in her magazines; and though she does not profess to pay them any idolatrous adoration, as Rome does to some of her saints, yet there are many of them, whom she goes out after with too great an extravagant fondness and admiration. Again, Methodism, like Rome, plays upon the fancy and imagination of her followers—works upon the nervous system and susceptibilities of many, more especially of her female votaries; she has a particular religious language, a conventional nomenclature and phraseology through which she addresses and stimulates them. Methodism

is specially a religion of excitement; is for stirring up and playing upon the frames and feelings, the sentiments and affections. Methodism is a species of spiritual *dram-drinking*, and more persons die through her intoxicating influence—under what we may call a spiritual “*delirium tremens*,”—than through any other Protestant system whatsoever. Well, then, having thus given what shall be called rather a pungent and severe, if not too caustic and satirical a description of Methodism, how, it may be asked, can I, with any consistency, hope, after such an exposure, that the taking up strongly, and the proclaiming boldly, such an opposing doctrine, as that of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ, would be apt to act as a bill of comprehension, so far as Methodism might be concerned? I reply, that I hope that it would answer this purpose upon the two following grounds:—First, that this sterling doctrine of truth being thus universally received, and spoken about by all the lovers of the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, would prove, not only the best antidote against the poisoning influence of Methodism in the particular neighbourhood; but might also, under the divine blessing, prove a kind of *panacæa*, by which Methodism herself might become regenerate, and renounce her Romanizing tendencies. But, secondly, it would act as a bill of comprehension, inasmuch as there are very many most serious, devout, and holy people of the Lord, who now are joined in the ranks of Methodism, from not knowing its principles and its tendencies; who, when this great light of heaven was brought, in the way of foil or contrast, to show up the darkness of Methodism, would flee out from her with as much expedition and anxiety, as they would flee from a charnel or a pest-house, or from a city inoculated with the plague.*

But I said, that the reception of this doctrine would

* Note N.

act secondly as a bill of *exclusion* ; and as such it will be most wise and prudent for the Church of England to take it up, and to stereotype it, by enshrining it amongst her articles, her general creed, and throughout all her liturgical services. For then all Rome, as well as all of Methodism, would be excluded, as of necessity, and of voluntary engagement, from her pale and communion ; for these could no more endure the reiterated effects of such opposing doctrine against their errors, than the bat can endure the light, or the culprit could fall in love with, and delight himself with his galling chains of servitude, or his lash of torture. And thus error would be got rid of, not as the superstitions of Rome are now being endeavoured to be got rid of from amongst us—namely, by the perpetual ding-dong ring of an ungracious grating controversy in our ears, and by the preaching up of, at best, but a half-informing *negative* system of Christianity ; but error would then be got rid of, according to the analogy and example set us by the God of nature himself, who drives away the natural darkness by letting in, silently and gradually, light upon it, and dispels sickness from the body after the same manner—viz., by letting in healthfulness upon the constitution. Ministers should ever remember that they are the followers of him, of whom it was prophetically announced, that “ he should not cry, nor lift up his voice in the streets, and yet that he should bring forth judgment unto victory.”* It has been strongly and pointedly remarked, the best way to exclude the chaff is to fill the vessel full of wheat. And I remember having the privilege of once, and, alas ! but once, of listening to the most eloquent, and the most arresting sermon I ever heard, from the late justly celebrated Dr. Chalmers. The preacher’s text was from 1 John xv.—“ If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.” The sermon is now

* Note O.

in print, and the writer of it has affixed the following title to it :—"The Expelling Power of a New Affection." As I have not now the discourse before me, and have never had the opportunity of reading it since, I can only give such an imperfect analysis as the distance of thirty years will permit. The preacher went upon this common and well-known aphorism—"that nature hates a vacuum;" and he illustrated this truth by stating that the acme of human misery was not to be found in the abode of human poverty, however wretched, desolate, and forsaken the wants of such victim might be; nor in the hospital, where the poor, agonized sufferer, stretched out on the table for operations, was awaiting, with anxious solicitude, the Surgeon's amputating knife to separate his ulcerated limb from his body; nor in the jail, where the convicted felon, laden with his clanking irons, and amidst the dark walls of the cell of the condemned, was under the horror of a remorseful conscience, expecting hourly his summons for execution; for, however dreadful in the extreme such and similar cases might appear to be, yet the acme of human misery was not, according to the aphorism, set forth above, reached to in any or all of them; but if you want to witness the *ne-plus-ultra* of human woe, you must come with me, cried the preacher, to the Lunatic Asylum, and there, when you find therein, amongst its melancholy inmates, one, on whose blank mind nothing in heaven above, nor on the earth beneath, hath any power to write on it a single sensible impression; then, indeed, you arrive at a stage of misery, than which no higher example can be sought out or imagined. And so Dr. Chalmers, in drawing a deduction from his illustrations, declared, that ministers did but *half* their duty, who *negatively* would, by their preachings, so influence the minds of their hearers, as to break up the love of this present evil world in their souls, but did nothing *positively* to fill up the blank or vacuum thus created, by providing

for them that most blessed substitute capable of filling the whole affections of their hearts, however large and expanded such might be ; even by "shedding abroad the love of God in their hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto them." Dr. Chalmers comes in here well to support me in what I stated above, as to the manner after which conversions from Romanism are being carried on *negatively* at present amongst us.

Other benefits might be mentioned to be derived from the adoption of the present proposed system ; some of them will, most likely, suggest themselves to many of my readers ; but as certain limitations must be assigned to this work, as well as to the patience of the public, I content myself with those I have here enumerated.

Just as the enterprising tourist who, finding himself amidst the interminable ranges of Switzerland's mountain scenery, is determined to undertake that which is considered the greatest achievement of modern pedestrianism, even to ascend Mont Blanc's highest elevation. Accordingly, providing himself with some experienced guide, as well as all other requisites for his bold and venturesome undertaking, with determined zeal, energy, and courage, he enters on his upward course ; with comparative ease and rapidity he scales height after height, until, at length, arriving at the region of interminable and perpetual snow, he enters on that which forms the great peril and labour of his projected enterprise ; here he halts to gather in fresh air, and to recruit his strength and courage, in order to surmount the difficulties and dangers which seem now ready to interpose on every side, so as to render almost impossible the performance of the chivalrous task which he had assigned himself ; his heart now seems ready to fail, and he becomes so terrified at the prospect before him, that sometimes he wishes he had never entered on the bold design at all ; but still he thinks it too late to recede, and being, moreover, cheered by the encouraging voice, and supported by the assisting arm of his faithful

guide, (his fides Achates,) onward and onward he presses upwards ; and, notwithstanding, that on the one side the frowning and terrific avalanche, with all its gathered accumulations, seems ready to overwhelm him in inevitable destruction ; notwithstanding that on the other side, he is met by the frightful mountain-gorge or ravine, which threatens to launch him into the unfathomable abyss of dreariness and death below ; notwithstanding that here again, the slippery and treacherous glacier must, with cautious and nervous step be passed over ; there again the tall and opposing rock presents itself to his view ; notwithstanding that these and other dangers, too numerous to be mentioned, must be overcome ; yet, our tourist, with steady, untiring, and unflinching step, pursues his journey, until, at length, standing on the mountain's summit-level, he finds his labour and perseverance more than amply repaid, by the accomplishment of the daring work he had proposed to himself. So may I say, that somewhat of similar sensations have I felt in trying to get over the mount after mount of opposition, (not without the assistance of the infallible guidance of the Spirit,) which lay in the way of the task, which I here set before me ; for, to borrow my imagery supplied by the above illustration, what, with the frowning weight or avalanche of authority meeting me on one side ; what, from the deep abyss of traditionary lore, on the other ; here the slippery glacier of long contracted prejudice—there the frowning precipice of superstition, unbelief, if not likewise of open and professed infidelity, along with the perpetual snows of ignorance, bigotry, &c., surrounding me on all sides ; the similitude seems but too palpable and striking. However, there are the following distinct differences between the supposed tourist, as he stands on Mont Blanc's alpine summit, and on my standing now on what I may term the summit level of the mount of grace of the glorious Gospel. For, in the first place, let us suppose that the tourist had selected the most favourable day

and time for his ascent, yet, after all, what has he to indemnify him for all the toil and danger which he has undergone? He has, indeed, done a certain feat which may gain him praise and honour comparatively among his fellow-tourists; but as far as any palpable advantage to himself has accrued, he has now spread before him, the bleak panorama of endless snow; not so the believer, who shall, with me, ascend the proposed summit-level of grace; he, like the holy Seer of old, (being placed on Pisgah's elevated top,) has miraculously spread before his astonished vision the whole length and breadth of the land of promise, with all its surprising and indescribable glories; even the things "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," and which the imagination of the natural man, stretched forth to its greatest power of perception, can by no means take in or comprehend.

But, secondly, the tourist has no sooner reached the acme of his ambition, but that in consequence of the rarefaction of the surrounding air, he finds respiration to be so difficult, and his whole position, by reason of the intense cold, so uncomfortable, so trying, and so dangerous, that he is forced to leave his elevated site, and make his descent towards the base of the mountain, with as much rapidity as his safety requires, and the circumstances of his remaining strength will permit. Not so with the believer who, through the adoption of the doctrine of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ, ascends the summit-level of grace; he not only need not, through any want of power of spiritual existence, come down from the exalted pinnacle of mercy unto which he has attained, but the longer and the more permanently he remains thus on high, does he get the means of breathing more freely, and the happier and more divinely blessed does he, in every respect, become.

Thirdly and lastly; there exists this difference between the tourist and the believer; the tourist has ascended to the very greatest range of height to which the

human constitution, or safety, seems capable of doing ; he has gained the *ne-plus-ultra* point of elevation to which it is desirable that any human being should reach unto, or for which he is physically capacitated, and that for *once*, perhaps, in his whole lifetime. Not so with the believer : from the elevation on which he stands he can perceive, looking by faith through the vistas of future glory, height upon height, mountain upon mountain, thrown, with interminable range, before his spiritual view, and unto the top of each of which, and others far beyond all faith's greatest ken, he expects, in the dispensation of the ages to come, to reach unto ; and from the summit-level of which, new panoramas of overwhelming sights of the great and infinite works of Omnipotence shall be given him to gaze upon ; and, moreover, from such accumulated heights of beaming glory he need never come down, but be getting higher and higher, and nearer and nearer to the approaches of that God with whom he shall spend the countless ages of eternity itself, and "in whose presence there is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore."*

* Note P.

SECTION III.

JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS.

I COME now to the third tribunal at which we must seek for justification, which is that of the world. As we take our stand to be justified in this court, a personal attendance will be demanded; no trial by proxy will be allowed here, any more than at the former tribunal; no doctrine of vicarious atonement or substituted righteousness will, for a moment, be permitted to be recognized in our favour at the bar of the world. Moreover, a new set of witnesses, in the place of those that pleaded in our behalf, at the former tribunals, must be called upon to testify for us here; for neither the righteousness of Christ, nor faith, nor evangelical repentance, as such, will be acknowledged as evidences on our behalf. They would not be known nor accredited, much less respected in the world's court of judicature. What does an unbelieving and a scoffing world understand of, or care about, for instance, either the righteousness of Christ, or of spiritual faith, or of evangelical repentance? To borrow the language of inspiration—"The world knoweth them not as it knew Christ not." Or, in the first place, if we would plead the righteousness of Christ as the ground of our justification before the world, the world that once crucified the Lord of glory, would treat such a plea as that of our standing on the vicarious merits of another, instead of our standing before it on our own personal merits, with the veriest insult and contempt. The

language of ridicule and taunt, if not of open profanity and blasphemy, would now, as of old, be sure to be cast up—"He saved others, himself he cannot save." And as for those sublime mysteries which I have argued upon throughout my present work, as coming into such close and indissoluble connection with the doctrine of justification—namely, those of election and the federal headship of Christ—as the ground of the salvation of believers, these would be pronounced by the world as the height of all fanaticism and enthusiasm—as mysteries engendered by merely excited feelings, and vain, deluded imaginations. Again: if we should talk of faith as a ground for our personal justification before the world's tribunal, the language would immediately be cast up to us—"Show us thy faith by thy works." Yes, works, and works alone, will stand for us as substantial testifiers at the world's bar. Bring these, she will cry, as witnesses into our court, and should they, upon true and strict examination being made, testify to your account, we shall acknowledge such to be true credentials in your favour; we shall respect such as tangible, palpable proofs which we can readily comprehend, and give fair and full credit to. But here again we must take care to find out that which the world, according to its definition of good works, will alone recognize at its bar as such; for should we, for instance, bring forward our "patience of hope, our labours of love, or our works of faith," to be pleaded for there, according to the high and Gospel meaning of such expressions—viz., as being of those fruits of spiritual "righteousness which, by Jesus Christ, are to the praise and glory of God the Father," the world will not care to search into such inward springs and motives of action; these are altogether too deep and too reconditely spiritual for its perception and regard.

The world looks merely to the outward surface of conduct, and, therefore, sets up a standard of practice

far below that which Christianity acknowledges; and consequently, unless our works meet the approving test of its inferior standard, however acceptable to God in Jesus Christ they may be, as being done—*e.g.*, from the motives above taken notice of, they will, nevertheless, be cast out and disregarded by the world as things, at best, indifferent, if not altogether to be condemned and trodden under foot. In a word, the world looks merely to its own polity and advantage; and, therefore, unless we can do works such as, according to the world's estimation, shall reach to the profit and outward well-being of society, we shall fail in substantiating our claims to its approval and satisfaction. To give a few examples, in order to elucidate my meaning:—Works of general, outward benevolence, such as in the world's definition of the term, are called works of charity, whether it be that by the distribution of our property we try to raise a tone of independence and comfort amongst all our poorer fellow-creatures, or whether we use such in the founding of hospitals, lunatic asylums, and such like public institutions; or, again, whether we employ ourselves, and our capital, in works of political economy—*e.g.*, for the purpose of giving greater employment to the industrious poor, or that of improving the practical system of agriculture in our country or in our neighbourhood—in short, all things that tend to the common weal of mankind; all such, and like kindred works, will at once receive the stamp and currency of the world's favourable opinion, and we shall thus, and, therefore, receive our justification at its hands.

Unless we are able to show something of such portable and practical good works—works which believers in Christ will be always, in their way and measure, ready to countenance and to promote, and unto which they will try to lend their patronage and approval, as being works useful and excellent in their kind—unless, I say, we can come forward to substan-

tiate our claims for good conduct and good character, by such open, avowedly useful performances, somewhat analagous to these mentioned above, we may speak of our inward impulses for the zeal and glory of God, as likewise of our spiritual inward frames, feelings, and affections, as much and as long as we please; but without something of this character of such actual, visible doings, however true and real our motives and desires may be in the judgment of Him who judgeth not as man judgeth, yet, in the judgment of the world, they will not be taken as evidence in our favour at all, but will be allowed to pass away like the dust before the wind, or as the water that is spilled and cometh to nought. "We must let our light so shine before men, that they may see our good works, (even those that shall be pronounced such by the world,) and may glorify our Father which is in heaven."

Thus, and thus alone, we shall obtain a verdict of acquittal, or justification, at the bar of the world's adjudication. Moreover, as the world loves its own, it will admit persons to practice what Christians would term gross, sensual indulgences, provided that they come up to the standard of what it denominates doing good. Thus, for example, it will allow persons in the use of lavish, and oftentimes worse than useless, selfish expenditure of money, provided only that they give largely, out of the remainder, in that which it terms charity, though no care be taken to inquire into the character of the person so relieved, or after what manner the money so bestowed may be spent. The world stops not to ask how worthless, profligate, and loose the characters so helped may be; the money has been given away, and the persons so bestowing are termed, according to the world's false nomenclature, charitable, kind, benevolent, and good-natured. Thus numbers pass current in society, and obtain a good report, who, before Him who searcheth out the hearts and the reins, may, notwithstanding, be proved guilty

of most fearful delinquencies—yea, and we may say also of outward debauchery of conduct. Thus easy is it to purchase, at comparatively a small price, the good opinion of the world; for, as Solomon says, “Every man is a friend of him who giveth gifts;” and again, “that which is highly esteemed amongst men is abomination in the sight of God.” Yea, and the converse of the proposition or declaration will also hold good; for let us take the example of a good man, according to the unerring standard of the Word of God, and we may see how little such will be thought of in the world’s estimation; yea, on the contrary, how they may be contemned, scouted at, and cast out as reprobate from the pale of its society. Barnabas was, we are told, “a good man, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost;” and although being a rich man, he sold all that he had and threw it into the common treasury to feed the saints of God, yet because Barnabas thereby confined his alms-giving to the household of faith, behold Barnabas, so far from meeting the approbation of the world, was, like his Great Master and his brother apostles, despised, rejected, persecuted, and ultimately martyred, by a hollow, unbelieving, and ungodly world.

However, as there can be no controversy or difficulty, in the minds of evangelical persons, about the subject-matter of this section; and as I have been obliged to be more diffuse than I anticipated in treating of the questions which came within our notice under the two former sections, by answering different objections which arose out of the various points of discussion therein canvassed; I am thankful to be able to bring the present section to a conclusion, by offering, very briefly, three or four practical remarks, in the way of admonition.

My first admonition is, that notwithstanding all such hollow and untrue decisions, to be met with at the bar of the world’s tribunal; still it would be wise in

T

believers, for the sake of recommending the religion of the Cross, to take the world upon its own showing, and to come up to its requirements, more especially as to all works of alms-giving, and all other things that may be considered by it as praiseworthy, virtuous, and of good report; taking care always, only that such works be done without any, the very least, compromise of Christian principle and motive. Through fear of being misunderstood in the above remark, I would add, that we are not (in bestowing our alms) to do so for the mere purpose of gaining the world's approbation, or to withhold them, (when upon Christian grounds we would desire to do so,) merely to avoid the reproach of the Cross. Our sole object must be uniformly to imitate our Blessed Saviour by always "going about doing good;" but still to do good in such a manner, so far as in our power lieth, as "to provide things honest in the sight of all men;" and to be cautious of making our pure and noble Christianity a ground of offence before an unbelieving or ungracious generation.

A second admonition I would put forth is, that whilst the world is so very blind in discovering the faults, and even glaring vices of its own votaries, so that it will smooth over such upon any, even the slightest pretext that it is able—by giving to many such characters the titles of good-natured, good-humoured, good-hearted, &c.—yet is it, with that most glaring inconsistency that belongs to it in all its general actions, ready with Lynceus' eyes to pry into, not merely those more glaring faults, into which, even the best are liable to fall, but the smallest foibles it will magnify sometimes into the most palpable sins and crimes. Hence, the entire necessity that lies upon Christians to walk circumspectly—to avoid all occasions of stumbling—and to make a conscience of all their ways. And such conduct will seem to be still more demanded of us when we take our high

standing and calling in Christ into consideration ; for the more pure and holy we profess to be—and what can, or ought to be higher or louder than the professions of Christians on such points?—the more will be required of us on the part of all men ; so that, that which might pass without observance in men of the world, will be denoted as worthy of the very highest censure in believers in Christ ; or, as we may illustrate the subject, if you take miry clay, and dash it against a wall previously comparatively dark, a passer-by may take no notice of the stain or blot ; whereas, if the same were done to a perfectly white wall, the blot would stand out with such palpable contrast, that the most careless and indifferent observer must remark it.

A third remark shall refer to the great doctrine or principle by which such godliness is to be habitually and consistently maintained ; and that I declare to be no other than the leading one advocated by me throughout this my work—namely, the “ vicarious justification of sinners in Christ ;” for what is that doctrine which the apostle holds up as the great school-master under Christ, for the promotion of all negative and positive holiness, but virtually the great doctrine of grace which I have all along here demonstrated ? Let one text suffice—Titus ii. 11–14—“ The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.” Now, here we have the negative holiness pointed out to us—viz., “ denying ungodliness and wordly lusts ;” and the positive holiness of the Gospel ; in which I would in passing remark, that we are taught our three-fold duty here—viz., our duty to ourselves by living *soberly*—that is, keeping all our passions under a sober restraint, and within proper moderation ; secondly, our duty towards our neighbour in living *righteously*—that is,

observing the golden rule of doing to others as we would they should do unto us; and our duty towards God—viz., in setting God always before us, not in the way of fear or distraction, but as our covenant God, our reconciled Father of mercies in Christ. Now, I ask one question—from what principle the apostle enjoins such duties? Is it that by our performing them we should get into the approbation of heaven? or is it not altogether from the sense that we have already obtained such? Is not the principle upon which the apostle proceeds exactly that which I have throughout urged in this treatise—viz., that we are not called upon to act, in order to obtain mercy, but because we have already obtained it; not to work *for* grace, but *from* grace already received? Hence the language as above—"The grace of God that bringeth salvation," &c.

The fourth and last remark I shall here make, shall be one not addressed to believers particularly, but to all classes of my readers generally. It shall be given in the way of admonition, calling upon them to avoid being deceived by this present evil world: and this I do because of the *dropsical* thirsting, the excessive craving that is in all men naturally after the world, and the things of it, its possessions and enjoyments, its distinctions and its riches, its pleasures and its honours; which insatiable craving becomes produced by the persuasion that the obtaining of these things renders a man blessed and happy; and that he is at once the most fortunate and enviable, if not the wisest and best, who secures for himself the greatest share and property in them; who can call "his houses and his lands after his own name; who can prepare raiment as the clay, and lay up gold and silver as the dust." Now, from this delusion, natural to the heart of man, I would pray my readers to beware of the great enchantress who would get us into her lap of ease and luxury, only as Dalilah got Sampson, to shear us of our

strength. Let us remember the warning of the rich man in the parable, pulling down his barns, &c. ; and the solemn advice given from his own dear-bought experience, by him who kept not his eyes back from anything that he desired, nor withheld his heart from any joy, and having seen and experienced all things done under the sun, left as the record of his well-weighed judgment, "that all is vanity and vexation of spirit." No ; be not deceived ; the whole world, if he had it, could not purchase for any man real and abiding happiness. For, omitting the awful issues of eternity—the future condemnation that the riches, the honours, and the pleasures of the world, according to the declaration of the Scriptures, so often *instrumentally* conduct to—even in this life, to their votaries, are they found incapable of securing what can be rightly called any abiding satisfaction—so true is it that even here, "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth ;" so true is it, that "she who liveth in pleasure, is dead while she liveth ;" so true is it, that the worldling shall "sow the wind, but reap the whirlwind ;" so true is it, that he is but pursuing a phantom that continually eludes his grasp—that "man never *is*, but always *to be* blessed."

As when the ignorant and benighted traveller, in the dark and lurid night, and in the trackless and devious way, suddenly sees a bright and pleasing light spring up upon his path, he rejoices and hails it as the propitious and well-omened guide of his future course. The attractive and fairy light glances in wanton and seductive play before his steps ; always contiguous, yet always forbidding actual contact and approach. The incautious traveller, unconscious whither his new and pleasing associate is conducting him, with rapid and adventurous step, advances forward, till, at the grey dawn of morning breaking on the mountain tops, behold his fallacious guide suddenly disappears, leaving him far removed from his destined route, and, perhaps,

inextricably enclosed amidst the fens and marshes of some bleak and desert country. Just so is he who, amidst the lurid darkness of this night of life, pursues the attractive and fairy light of worldly wealth, pleasure, and honour. For a while the seducing glory may please, and the unwary votary follow on, looking for a prosperous and blessed issue to his course—dreaming of wondrous happiness and enjoyment to come, till, at length, the morning of the day of eternity breaking on his view, the delusion vanishes, and he finds himself the deceived and ruined victim of, indeed a splendid and imposing, but no less of a decided and deadly cheat. The whole world is but an *ignis fatuus*—a false light that lures man to destruction, to misery, and to death; and he is not wise who allows himself to be deceived thereby. There seems room here allowed to introduce the beautiful epigram of the pious Dr. Dodrige, in reference to the world's maxim, “*Dum vivimus vivamus*”—

“Live while you live, the epicure would say,
And seize the pleasure of the present day.
Live while you live, the sacred preacher cries,
And give to God each moment as it flies.
Lord, in my views let both united be;
I live in pleasure when I live to thee!”

Yes, truly, the only ground of true happiness is the presence of God in the soul; or, to use Scripture language—“Christ formed in the heart, by faith, the hope of glory.” Truly, religion’s “ways are ways of pleasantness, and all *her* paths are peace.”

Now, the great remedy to break up this delusiveness, with which the world entwines itself naturally round all our hopes, desires, and pursuits, is, to throw ourselves fully, spiritually, and permanently into that splendid doctrine of grace, to sustain which, before the believer’s mind, I have undertaken to write the present volume—viz., “the *vicarious* justification of sinners in Christ.” I shall only quote one passage of Scripture

to bear me out thoroughly in this remark; it will be found in Gal. vi. 14, where the apostle, in his noble, enthusiastic spirit, cries out—"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." Now, here the apostle supports his declaration by the illustration of a double-supposed crucifixion. He first puts the world on the cross, and then he argues that it would be as idle for his soul, filled with the rich and glorious consolations that were flowing into it, from having embraced the mercy that came to it through the doctrine of the atonement, to glory in anything that the world could offer—its riches, its honours, and its pleasures—as for him to glory in that which was dying, and soon to become dead, before his eyes. And then, secondly, taking down the world, as it were, from the cross, he supposes himself to be impaled on it; and what could a man, in such a position, care about the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them, playing in the fullest splendour, and most attractive dress before his mind?

As there are three distinct tribunals, at whose respective bars justification would be demanded of us; so there are three distinct *periods* assignable to these three acts of justification. The first, or our vicarious justification in Christ, was determined for the elect Church in the councils of eternity; the second takes place when believers are enabled, by the Spirit of God, to repent and believe the Gospel; and the third, when the moral effects of such repentance and faith are so evidenced before the world in the believer's general conduct and practice, as to secure its favour and approbation.

And as there are three periods assigned for each of these three justifications, so there is a threefold diversity as to the mode and character of the verdict to be obtained in each of the above courts. Thus, for instance, as respects the judgment in the first, the pecu-

liarity of the case is, that although the award by infinite justice is decreed, yet there is no open sentence recorded. The award decreed is kept close in the mind of the Great Judge himself from the world altogether, (see 1 John iii. 1, 2,) and even from the persons in whose favour the adjudication is made, for a certain time—that is, until the Spirit of God witnesseth, through the operation of faith and repentance being worked in our hearts, that we are the children of God. The peculiarity of the second award is, that it is made in a man's own conscience, or to his own Christian experience. A believer, therefore, is hereby called upon to make his calling and election sure to himself, by proving his faith to be a real, genuine, spiritual, heaven-born faith—namely, by adding to his faith, knowledge, temperance, brotherly kindness, charity, &c., and all those other graces and virtues which should flow from a true faith as necessarily and as naturally as the ripened fruit, to be gathered in due season in the master's basket, hangs pendent in golden clusters, in the autumnal season, from every good and valued tree. The peculiarity respecting the judgment in the third justification, as distinct from the two former, is, that there is no guise or concealment here; that since our whole conduct must be undisguised and legible to all in the world with whom we have to do, so the award or verdict, either in our favour or otherwise, must be open or public also; it will be pronounced in the open court of the world's judicature.

There is an old scholastic definition of justification which, with some alteration, may be made to agree with the three phases which I have now thrown upon the one shield of justification. It is that whereby believers are said to be justified "*meritoriously* by the righteousness of Christ; *instrumentally*, by faith; and *declaratively*, by good works." The exception that I take to this definition concerns the second clause—namely, that whereby the inventors of it would hold

up faith as the instrument, in the way of formal cause or plea, of justifying the sinner before God. Now, if instead of this most false and dangerous position, we make faith to be merely the instrument *for revealing* the righteousness of Christ—the only ground of the sinner's justification before God—to the soul, then we shall have a definition most complete and most useful, as being so easily remembered—one also that will be coincident with the view I have recommended in this work to the judgment of my readers for their adoption; for then we shall have their proper place and honour given at once to Christ, to faith, and to good works: Christ obtaining, as, of course, he should always do, the first great office in the sinner's justification—the whole elect Church being justified *vicariously* before God, upon the ground of his merits alone; faith coming up to the second place, and assuming the high office and privilege of revealing this great truth to the soul of the believer, and receiving or “apprehending that for which we had been apprehended” in Christ from eternity; and good works coming up in the third place to prove to our own souls, as evidences not to be mistaken, of the reality of such spiritual apprehension; as well as making the world take cognizance, through the medium of our holy walk and conversation before it, that “we have been with Jesus.”

END OF SECTION III.

RECAPITULATION.

DEMOSTHENES being asked in what eloquence consisted, gave his answer in one word—"delivery." Dr. Chalmers being asked in what the power of preaching consisted, gave his answer also in one word—"repetition." Most certainly this was the doctor's own motto; for no person repeats more than he does, in all his published sermons. His general method is, to take one striking idea—like that, for instance, which I gave in the sermon of his, which I partly analyzed; (see p. 263;) and he carries this throughout his whole discourse—beginning, continuing, and ending with it. His is the very best specimen of the cumulative style of writing and of argument. Like the mechanic who, taking up his hammer, strikes the nail on its head, and repeats, again and again, the blow, until he lodges it home in the place in which he wishes to fix it; there is no person that "fastens the nail in the sure place" more powerfully and more completely than Dr. Chalmers. Or, like the person who, taking up his flail, strikes, again and again, the sheaf, and doth not desist whilst any grain is left therein; there is no man who threshes the wheat out of a text better than the learned doctor; or, lastly, it is the repetition of the eave's drop on the marble flag below; his is the reiteration of the Latin proverb—

"Gutta cavat lapidem, non vi, sed sæpe cadendo."

I mean to fortify myself behind so great an example; and, therefore, if asked what I think the power of re-

capitulation consists in, I would also answer in one word — "*selection*." At least, I intend to use this as my motto on the present occasion. I should be sorry to inflict the penalty of so much dulness on my readers, as to attempt to repeat, *seriatim*, the review of my arguments in this work. I shall confine myself to the bringing forward a few of the more salient points of the controversy; and if I should use repetition here, it is not so much for the mere sake of going over the ground a second time—as by reason of the vast importance of the subject canvassed—as also because I find the particular views, against which I object, have been most dexterously used by my opponents after the same manner. As the bad cause has profited by repetition, I wish that which I am fully persuaded is the truth, should gain by the same—"fas est ab hoste doceri." In a word, I wish to fix the leading subjects of Gospel truth firmly and substantially, like the pyramid settled on its broad base, in the minds of my readers.

The first point I wish here to repeat concerns that truth reiterated, again and again, in this book—"The vicarious justification of sinners in Christ." And I take this as my chosen text, in order, by it, to expel even the very shade of Arminianism from amongst us. This is such a noble truth, that if it had been built up firmly and prominently into the Articles of our Church, then, along with its counterpart, the seventeenth Article, it had kept out this deadly evil from having been allowed to get entrance into the body of the national Church. Arminianism, than which there is no more fearful and noxious error; Arminianism, which is eating out the spiritual vitality of the constitution of the national Church like a canker; Arminianism, which is such a fatal enemy to the truth of the *grace* of the Gospel, that so far from wishing to settle it, as I have just said, like the pyramid on its base, it would invert the whole order of the divine mind respecting this sub-

ject, so as to put a pyramid on its apex, and make the whole topple over, and lie prostrate in ruins on the earth. Yes, I cannot caution my readers too strongly against this noxious evil, it meets us in so many forms—Proteus-like it assumes so many shapes—comes up before the mind in the assumed garb of so much apparent simplicity and humility. Again: it is so congenial to our fallen nature—supports and cherishes in us the pride so natural to the human heart. Never does Satan more readily and more effectually “transform himself into an angel of light,” than when he visits us through the medium of this most seducing heresy; and such, indeed, has palpably been the case, by his being allowed to bring the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, with such tempting and overwhelming force before the minds of the reformers of the sixteenth century, as to make them put it amongst all the confessions of faith of the Protestant Churches. And now, I ask, what means the constant preaching up of the dogma of baptismal regeneration on all sides in the sister kindom, with the revival of liturgical forms and ceremonies, but the determination to keep the spirit of Arminianism in the land. And though numbers may not, and others will not, see the danger arising to the national Church, by the permission of this evil remaining within its body; yet I feel persuaded, that unless we get rid of it, it will get rid of us; that unless we purge out this old leaven from amongst us, the old proverb will tell against us, and this little leaven of self-righteousness, unbelief, and pride, soon leavening the whole lump, or pervading, directly or indirectly, the whole mass of professors and ministers in the Establishment, or, at least, the great majority of them, “Ichabod” shall be written upon the outward temple of the national constitution; and the whole fabric shall come, through the divine judgment of the Lord upon it, tumbling to the ground at once. And here I think I can perceive a reason why

God permitted this fatal theorem to originate, and to remain so long amongst us, and that was, for the purpose of marring the pride of man—viz., by allowing him to become too much enamoured by the work of his own hands. To speak plainly; I verily believe, that it is the intention of Providence to uproot all national ecclesiastical establishments from out of the whole of Christendom; and that, moreover, not after a very long period; and, therefore, he has permitted this deadly poison of Arminianism more or less to infect and to envenom all these Church policies, in order that he may have a just and equitable ground for removing all these institutions of merely human device and performance, to make way, in his own predicted time, for that spiritual temple—even the universal Church which shall yet fill and embrace, within its ample and charitable enclosures, the whole family of mankind. At all events, whether right or wrong in the above view and exposition, we have a double difficulty to encounter. First, we have *negatively* to get rid of the error, before secondly, we can *positively* establish the truth. The enemy is within the walls, and that also for so great a length of time, that he has now entrenched himself so strongly behind his many ramparts and parallels of munition and defence on every side thrown up, that to dislodge him from his present position amongst us, will be no easy matter, and that because it is a position, let it be remarked, that from prescription of usage and of time, he has long since written down to be his own property, and out of which he never expects to be ejected. Yes; we have allowed “*the wooden horse*” to get within our walls, and Luther has been, however unwittingly and unwillingly, the *Sinon* who seduced our forefathers to give it entrance amongst us. I am one of those who, with Laocoon of old, am ever ready to cry out—“*Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.*” I do not like, I acknowledge, converted priests being introduced, *ad saltum*,

into the Protestant ministry; forasmuch as having drunk in, not only the essence, (I have already, in my category, set down Methodism as involving this,) but the concoction of the essence of Arminianism (so to speak) with the milk at their mothers' breasts whilst they remained within the pale of the Church of Rome, they seldom come forth from it altogether free from such early and such long contamination and inoculation. And thus Luther, however raised up by God, in other respects, as a great light and benefit of his own and afterages, did not altogether shake off either the trammels or the prejudices of his early education and initiation within the walls of the Vatican. So true is the saying, that it is hard to "touch pitch without being defiled," and also another proverb, even "that which is bred in the bone, it is most difficult to extract from the flesh." And thus Luther showed his Pharisaic or Arminian spirit as yet cleaving to him, not only by his imposition upon the Churches of his favourite dogma, "*Doctrina stantis, aut cadentis ecclesiæ*," but also of his holding so tenaciously to his other curiously-invented dogma of "consubstantiation;" as likewise either his disbelief in the doctrines of the divine predestination and election, the federal headship of Christ, or else his industrious exclusion of them from his system of theology; and all these errors arose from the slime from primitive Romanism or Arminianism still remaining about him. However, as I said, "the wooden horse" is within our walls, and we must either get it out, or it will get us out; we must either destroy it, or it will destroy us. It will, therefore, be the wisdom, as well as the imperative religion, of all the evangelical clergy in England and in Ireland, as well as every other pious member in the land, with united effort, to unseat from his too-well-established and usurped dominion this formidable power, and to fill up the breach already made by its entrance in the walls of the outward Zion, by the substitution of that noble bulwark of the truth, even "the vica-

rious justification of sinners in Christ," which would hereby not only repair the wide-spread gap and damage done, but would so repair it, as to stand out like the high-built and impregnable bastion, and hinder this enemy henceforth from being able to make any impression against us.

A second salient point that I wish to bring forward into greater prominence and notice through the means of my recapitulation is, the great end that God had in the creation of all things. This has been the manifestation or setting forth of his own glory. *Self-manifestation* is the end of God in the creation of this earth and all things therein; but more especially is this manifestation of God's character made known unto his creatures, through the medium of the Church, as we may see by the following passage:—"To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God;" and by the Church, under this present dispensation, is the revelation of that character of God, which contains (like the doctrine lately discussed under the first head in this part) all Gospel in it, even that character of God which demonstrates him as the God of *grace and mercy* to us his fallen creatures. This is Gospel; and without such revelation of the mind of God to us there could be no Gospel at all. The Gospel is the revelation of what God is *to us*, and not what *we are* to God. The Gospel is the exhibition of *God's* heart to us, and not of *our* heart to God. The Gospel is the manifestation of the love of God the Father to us in Christ, not the manifestation of our love to him. The Gospel is an exchange of hearts; it is God's bestowing first his large heart of love upon us, and thereby causing us, in the way of reciprocal gratitude, to offer our heart of love to him. The Gospel is love begetting love. When God gave the command—"My Son, give me thine heart," he did not mean there

should take place within us that which forms an anomaly of nature, and that which is contrary to her course and liking, according to the well-known proverb, that "nature hates a vacuum;" but when the God of grace made such a demand upon us, it was through the intent of pouring out, richly and profusely, his own free, pure love first upon us, which would more than fill up any vacancy thus created within us, even that love which, in its "length, and breadth, and height, and depth," is said "to pass knowledge." In a word, the Gospel is the experience of what is passing within the mind of God towards us; but not the experience of that which is passing in our minds towards God. Now, here is a distinct difference, and it is the difference that distinguishes the two systems here set forth. The system I advocate is that which presents the former view as Gospel to the mind; the Arminian system would substitute the latter instead of the former. According to the former system, we are expected to be engaged, mainly and chiefly, and most certainly primarily, in the consideration of what God has done for us; according to the latter, we are to be engaged, primarily and chiefly, in the contemplation of what we are to do for God. According to the former, we are to work from the sense or experience of mercy already, freely and from eternity, bestowed upon us in Christ; according to the latter, we are supposed to be working, in order to obtain mercy. The former, according to the view now given, will be perceived to be a system of perfect freedom; the other is a system of complete bondage. According to the former, we work from the assurance of a justification effected for us; according to the latter, we are working to effect this justification. According to the former, it is a feat accomplished; according to the latter, it is a feat to be accomplished. According to the former, by reason of the doctrine of the federal headship of the saved Church in Christ, believers are represented as having

U

been put to the proof, tested, and tried in Christ ; but Christ having been found perfect, "being justified by the Spirit," and we taking our standing and calling in him, ("as he is, so we are in this world") are found perfect and justified before the Father. We have pleaded by proxy, by substitution, by representation, in Christ before him, and, therefore, as far as regards the doctrine of justification, we go unladen, unburdened, without anxiety, and without accountability. We roll all our burden here upon Christ ; he is responsible to the Father for the redemption of the promised seed ; we hold no responsibility ourselves in the matter. This is Gospel, good news indeed, real glad tidings of the greatest joy—of the richest and most unspeakable comfort. Not so with those on the other side. The *fides sola* system, purposely discarding the doctrine of the federal headship out of view, loses, in consequence, all the blessed consolations which come to the soul through the medium of this divinely-suggested truth. Those who preach up the latter system are putting their hearers upon the performance of a thing for which they have no one qualification or power to undertake ; they are setting before them that which can never be executed ; they are forcing them to engage in an impossibility ; they are commanding them to do that themselves—viz., by the operation of faith and repentance—which has been already done perfectly for the elect Church, by Christ himself ; they are desiring them to "hew out cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water," rather than have recourse to him who, to every true believer in Christ, is the fountain of living waters, and who, like the perennial overflowing well, is ready to fill them up to the fullest measure of their spiritual capacities with heaven's blessings. Verily, we are not straitened in him ; we are only straitened through our own want of faith. We receive grace according to the measure of our faith ; hence the necessity of the continually putting

forth of the apostle's prayer—"Lord, increase our faith."

Like two opposing mirrors, which mutually reflect light one upon the other, so is the light which comes with increasing power from the Old and New Testament Scriptures to the mind, which spiritually understands, and inwardly digests, their blessed truths. It has been well remarked, that it was the same spiritual Sun of righteousness which illuminated both hemispheres; although under the first the light came upon the Church through the medium of shadowy types and ceremonies; but under the second, these types and ceremonies being removed, the light shines down now upon the Church with full blaze of cloudless lustre, grace, and glory. Taking advantage, then, of the circumstances above developed, I wish to borrow some further light, to be thrown upon my subject, by referring back to a fact connected with the ritual that was commanded to be observed, on the great day of annual atonement, under the old law. The fact I refer to will be found in Lev. xvi. 17—"And there shall be *no man* in the tabernacle of the congregation, when Aaron goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place;" but after the atonement was made, then the doors of the tabernacle were thrown open, and the people were allowed to worship, after their usual manner, in the outward court. From this circumstance I make the three following deductions:—The first is, that if any one of the people could, by any possibility, force himself into the tabernacle whilst Aaron was making atonement in the holy place, that one single intrusion would negative or destroy the efficacy of the whole work of atonement. The second deduction I make is, that no true, understanding Jew would think of entering the tabernacle to perform any service therein, with any reference, in whole or in part, towards accomplishing the work of atonement for sins, but would join in the public worship with the mind and con-

science quite lightened, and without any anxiety upon this point, as knowing that, according to divine institution, Aaron, or his successors in the high priesthood, had been appointed to take this office upon themselves for the whole people. The Jewish worshipper would, therefore, roll the whole responsibility, as to atonement being made for his sins, upon the officiating high priest; and seeing that he had laid them upon the head of the scape-goat, which was sent into the wilderness never to be seen again, so the worshipper would have no more conscience as to those sins in reference to any judgment coming against them from the Lord, than if they had never been committed. Respecting them he would feel perfectly justified, and would go light-hearted, free, and at liberty. The third deduction I would make regards the mode or kind of service which the spiritual worshippers in the tabernacle were wont to offer up from time to time, and which, no doubt, consisted of (along with the rites peculiar to that dispensation) humiliations, confessions, supplications, petitions, thanksgivings, &c.; and with regard to one and all these their privileges and performances not any of them could have been done, directly or indirectly, with reference to the work of atonement—a work to be done altogether, *ab extra*, or out and separate from themselves.

Now, to bring these points of deduction to apply to cases under the Gospel dispensation. The first would display to us the impossibility of any human interference or performance whatsoever in the work of atonement; and if any man would attempt to appear before God with his faith and repentance, or any other spiritual exercise whatsoever, he would go thereby to negative, or set aside the whole work, just as effectually as any person presuming to get entrance, contrary to the divine mandate, into the tabernacle, whilst the high priest was in the holy of holies, would neutralize thereby the whole offering for sin that was therein

being made. In no way could there be an attempt made to dishonour the finished work of Christ more than by such presumptuous and uncalled-for intrusion. The second remark I would make has reference to the character under which each worshipper is presumed to appear, when coming into our outward courts of service under the Christian dispensation. Borrowing instruction in this matter from the type here set before us, it will, at once, appear he must come in the character of one that has been already justified in Christ—as one already accepted in the beloved by the Father. And, indeed, it would be anomalous to call the members of our congregations Christians at all, unless we looked upon them as justified and accepted in Christ; for, as St. Paul reasons, (Romans viii. 9,) “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” And as also John says, (1 John v. 12,) “He that hath the Son, hath life;” but what is this life but that spoken of in Romans v. 18?—“Even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, to justification *of life*.” And, indeed, to refer back to the type, no worshipper under the Christian dispensation should be allowed amongst our congregations to join in the service, unless he came in the same spirit and frame of mind, under which the enlightened Jew entered into the tabernacle, under the old dispensation. But as the Jew dare not enter into the tabernacle, according to Lev. xvi. 17, until the atonement was perfected; so the Christian, by parity of contrast, should not come to our outward temples, except under the full assurance of the understanding that his atonement had been effected for him in Christ. Hence, our Church Service very properly opens with the supposition, that all who come into her outward courts, come there under such discipline and instruction; she throws them all back upon their professions and privileges; she addresses them as true believers—“dearly beloved *brethren* ;” to do otherwise would be to dis-

honour the finished work of Christ, to derogate from his perfected atonement. But whatever may be the teaching of the Church in this matter, I ask, is the teaching from the pulpit always in harmony and safe-keeping with looking upon the hearers as those already justified in Christ, and addressing them as such? Now, whatever may be the practice of those who, holding to the *solafidian* theorem, who are called evangelical clergy, (and here, of course, I cannot be supposed to have sufficient data to form a correct judgment,) if such be true to their retaining of their belief in Article XI., their theory stands out in direct opposition to the teaching of the Church Service as above referred to. For the doctrine of that Article is designed to tell the hearers, not that they are to look upon themselves as already justified, but rather by searching into their inward experiences to make their faith and repentance the ground of their justification. Believers in this system must look upon justification as a thing *future*, and to be desired, rather than as a thing *past*, and done for them by another; they must regard it as a thing to be longed for and attained unto, rather than that which has already been accomplished. Yes, the advocates of the above system, to be found true to, and consistent with their own theory, must proclaim a Gospel to be effected individually by each of their hearers for himself, rather than issue forth the proclamation of a Gospel already effected for the whole saved Church. They must tell the people what they are to do for themselves in such a case, rather than tell them what God in Christ has already done for them. But as this is rather a serious charge to bring against my brethren of the ministry, I would wish to show how far I am supported in making it, by adducing three or four specimens of the kind of preaching I object against, and which I myself have heard from persons who would be sorry to be put down in any category of ministry, than that which I have here recorded.

The first specimen, as being one of the most frequent, that I shall here adduce, is that class of sermons which holds up repentance after a legal manner; for instance, making it consist of sorrow for sin, attrition, conviction, conversion, &c.; and the whole discourse, perhaps, thus carried on after a whining, lachrymose manner; and these things so held up before the people, as forming a ground, or qualifying condition for their justification, rather than repentance being brought forward according to its true evangelical or Gospel explanation. (See p.p. 230-232.) Another specimen may be taken from those who hold up death and judgment to come, after a manner, so as to make many of the congregation, who have sensitive nerves, shake like the aspen leaf before the wind. I have heard, for instance, a minister in my own pulpit preach from 2 Cor. v. 10, 11, in a way that would better accord with the Romish, Tractarian views set forth in Dr. Pusey's sermon on "The Judgment Day," than with sentiments that should come from the lips of one who, in other respects, was one of the most truly Gospel ministers. And also, another minister from Heb. ix. 27, just in the same style, each of them wielding the terrors of the law with as affrighting an aspect as though they were preaching three thousand years ago, under the legal dispensation; whilst not one Gospel motive seemed to be adduced to set forth any of the arguments they would sustain before the people. Now, with regard to this last text, Heb. ix. 27—"It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment," taking it in connection with the verse that follows, we find that the two advents of the Lord are brought in, to completely neutralize any rising of fear in the believer's mind, with regard to these two solemnising truths; thus, to neutralize any fear of death, the first advent, and more especially the offering of Christ, as bearing the sins of many, meets us in the first clause of the next verse, as forming the ground or

subject-matter of the great faith of the Gospel; and the glorious second advent, as forming the ground or subject-matter of the great hope of the Gospel, meets us in the second clause; and so this view of the whole context is made to harmonize with that which I set forth as being the true Gospel application of the first verse—2 Cor. v. 10, (see pp. 83–89.) “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.”—Heb. ix. 28.

A third specimen, is the case of those preachers who seem so fond of electrifying their hearers by lengthened and terrific descriptions of the tortures of the damned, who hold up the flames of hell so as to frighten their congregations into good behaviour, as some very silly women would try to terrify the minds of little children committed to their care, into good conduct, by holding up to them stories of ghosts and hobgoblins. Now, in all serious wisdom, it is not by such means we shall ever be able to restrain the vicious propensities of any of the members of our congregations, and much less to make them adopt principles of solid piety and reform. We should remember that God has tried two experiments, so to speak, with the human mind. He first tried the experiment of the law, and giving this out amidst all the rolling thunders and flashing lightnings from Sinai's top, he did, most certainly, for a time, force the people, through the medium of their terror-stricken consciences, into a momentary and involuntary submission; for, whilst the mount was “burning with fire, amidst the blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of the trumpet,” the people, shaken to the very core of their hearts with terror and amazement, begged of Moses, their mediator, that “the word spoken to them should be spoken no more; and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.” But their submission was merely

momentary ; for whilst Moses was up in the mount, we find the people, with Aaron at their head, making an image, which they called their god, like unto a calf, and falling down and worshipping it. No ; the law, with all its terrors, makes people only steel and close their hearts against all divine impressions and demands ; and, therefore, it was not until God tried the second experiment, and coming to meet his people—no longer amidst the frowning majesty of severe justice, but with the olive branch of reconciliation—inviting us to “ Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,” &c., that he got access to, and won upon the otherwise seared and hardened consciences of sinners. Now, this is the lesson for us, ministers, to learn ; we are as ambassadors of peace ; our commission under Christ is one of mercy and of grace ; we are to be helpers of the people’s joy. And it is by no means going forward in advance of the age in which we live, but on the other hand retrograding upwards of three thousand years, as I said above, to use our pulpits, whose sounding boards ought to be resonant with the music of angels, the joy of God’s elect, to echo back the horrid accents of despair and terror. No ; if you wish to engage my love, it is not by peremptory command you can ever force my affections ; it is not by assuming the aspect of severity that you can thus awe me into submission ; you must put on the aspect of attraction, of gentleness, of kindness, and of persuasion ; and hardened, and perverse, and obstinate, and rebellious as human nature is, it cannot, and will not resist such constant solicitations and approaches made to it, without by-and-by perceiving the hand of faith being put to the bolt ; and it will be drawn back by little and little, until the whole, that barred God’s entrance, being removed, “ the love of God will be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost thus given to us ;” for we will “ love him, because he *first* loved us.” The well-known fable of the contest

between the wind and the sun is so appropriate, that I cannot resist the temptation of bringing it forward to illustrate the point here under discussion. The controversy was, which of them would deprive the traveller of his coat first. The precedence is given to the wind, and it begins to send forth the blasts of its fury with more and more piercing violence against the traveller, in order to drive the coat by main force from his back ; but behold, the fiercer and louder the wind blows, the tighter and tighter the traveller enwraps himself in his cloak, until at length buttoning it completely under his chin the wind gave up the contest. And now, the sun coming forward in its turn, is found playing, or breathing upon the traveller with its soft, warm, and benign beams ; as the sun puts forth its brightness with increasing power, the traveller is seen unbuttoning his coat, until at length opening it wider and wider about him, under the influence of the genial glowing heat, he lays it aside altogether ; and thus the victory proves, the warm sun-beams of love will effect that which the fiercer storm of indignation and wrath, however righteous, would never have accomplished.

The fourth specimen that I shall bring forward will be found in Phil. ii. 12. Now, respecting this passage, I have heard it again and again explained, as though it referred to the work of the sinner's justification before God, whereas, according to the context, it can have no such meaning ; for, to whom has the apostle addressed this epistle, but to those who are looked upon as the already justified in Christ ? Compare—*e.g.*, his opening address, including his beautiful prayer for them. (See Phil. i. 1-11.) In this paragraph we find Paul, declaring his confidence, at the sixth verse, that God had already begun the good work in them, and that, therefore, he was assured that he would perfect it in them unto the day of Christ. Now, what was this good work, but that which we may term, the very starting post of the Christian race, even that justifica-

tion unto life spoken of as accomplished by Christ, in and by himself *alone*, for his whole saved people or elect Church? (See Romans v. 18.) And, indeed, without the communication of such spiritual life, previously given to the members of our congregations, we might as well be sent to the catacombs, and preach to the physically dead, as to those who are pronounced morally "dead in trespasses and sins," until Christ comes to quicken them by breathing the breath of life on the dry bones. But just as, with that new and mysterious power called chloroform, surgeons now can throw their patients into a state of coma or insensibility, and amputate one of the largest members of the body, without the patient feeling any torture or pain; or, as by Arnoldizing, (as the technical term is, from the name of the inventor, Surgeon Arnold,) or infri-generating—*e.g.*, that is, benumbing the parts with such an icy coldness, the surgeon can then insert the knife round about the part thereby deadened, so as to prevent any pain that otherwise would have been caused; so these spiritual anatomists, as I may call them, separate texts from the living body of the Word, with apparently as much ease, and without any obstruction. But, unfortunately for them, the illustration goes farther than they would desire; forasmuch as the part separated under the above process, from the living body of the patient, becomes deprived of all vitality and power; so with those passages which are cut out from their bearings in the context, they lose all their life-giving efficacy also; and of which, those texts now introduced as specimens will serve as an ample illustration.

By such contrariety between the pulpit and the reading-desk, our Church is open to the renewal of the taunt made against it by the great Earl of Chatham, in his day—*viz.*, "that we had Calvinistic articles, an Arminian clergy, and a Popish liturgy;" Popish in the sense, I suppose, that Mr. Macaulay

gives of it in page 94, vol. 3, as already quoted—i.e., “being derived from Rome.” Yes, the gold of the Gospel is to be found at Rome, though under such a superincumbent weight of layers upon layers of thick clay, that it seems most hard to extract it. We confess that we have borrowed a great part of our Anglican Prayer Book from the Roman Catholic Missal. The glory of the Church of England, as above the other Protestant dissenting bodies is, that it did not reject everything of traditionary lore, but only so much as she conceived to be alien to the spirit of the “truth as it is in Jesus.” Hence, we wing our devotions in our public service under the influence of the same accents of piety, which winged the accents of the devotions of the Ignatiuses, the Polycarps, the Chrysostoms, the Augustines, &c.

But it will be asked me, first, that as I do not admit any part of the Church Service to be intended for unjustified persons, what meaning then do I annex to the confessions, absolutions, supplications, thanksgivings, &c.? To this I answer, that I annex the same meaning to them as was conjoined to those of similar services of the worshippers under the Old Law; which, as we have seen in our reasonings already on the subject, could not, directly or indirectly, have reference to the work of atonement, which had been performed altogether independently of the individual worshipping in the tabernacle, even by the high priest in the “holy of holies.” But, again; I say these services are being performed for the same purposes, that the various injunctions in the Epistles were enjoined on the *believers*, to whom these Epistles were exclusively addressed. Now, one and all these injunctions were commanded to be done by such, not at all with the least injunction to the work of justification, unto which the writers had recognised all their converts to have attained. Hence, all these, with our Church Services, must be looked upon as appertaining to the

gradual growth of sanctification in their souls. It is desirable in the spiritual, as in the natural world, that when a child is born, it should have provided for it such congenial and nutritious food, as may not only sustain it in being, but admit also of its gradual growth, until it arrives at the stature and proportions of the perfect man. And so with believers; not merely must the Child Jesus be begotten within their souls, or, to use Scriptural language, "Christ be formed in their hearts the hope of glory;" but that which is thus formed within them by the operation of the Holy Ghost, must be so nourished in them, day after day, that as it may grow in years, so it may grow in grace, and in favour both with God and man. Now, as the God of nature has provided for the little new-born babe, that which is at once the most palatable and nutritious aliment, and which, when analyzed, is discovered to have no acidity mixed with it, (as acids are said to stunt the growth rather than increase it,) so Peter, using the same illustration, desires his converts to lay aside all those sour things that would go to derange the stomach, and mar and adulterate the "sincere milk of the Word," which the spiritual mother has ready to give out from the "breasts of her consolation," to her new-born offspring.

And thus we come to answer another question that may be put to us—namely, disapproving, as we have shown by various examples of the kind of preaching generally adopted by solafidean ministers, what preaching would I adopt in its place? "To this I answer, that there is one course which, following, we never can go wrong. Our business is to preach the *Gospel*; and thus Peter, in the verse connected with the one just referred to, says—"born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible seed, even of the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever; and this is the word which, by the *Gospel*, is preached unto you."

Paul says of himself—"Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel;" and again, in Gal. i. 8, he says—"Though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." In a word, our distinctive office under Christ is to be ambassadors of *peace*. Now, suppose Russia, with whom we are at present at war, having negotiated a peace with us, would select a person whom she thought suitable to represent her at the English court, and such person coming to London would, upon breaking the seals of his commission, sound forth in English ears words of terror, alarm, reproach, threatenings, vengeance, &c.!--what would be thought of the conduct of Russia, through her representative minister, under such circumstances? Surely no person would think that she was serious in wishing to keep up terms of amity with our country? She could not think that Englishmen would tolerate such language as this, or that anything less than notes for a renewal of hostilities between the two countries could arise out of it. And what then can be considered of the conduct of those ministers who, being entrusted with a heavenly mission of mercy and of grace, should so far forget the great responsibility committed to them, that instead of delivering the message they have got from God to sinners, in the soothing and appropriate language of kindness and of love, would use the precious opportunities allowed them, in thundering denunciations of heaven's wrath against the ungodly, endeavouring, by holding up terrible and affrightening pictures of the torments of the reprobate in the next dispensation, to scold or alarm their people into duty, thus going back to the beggarly elements of the law, rather than advancing to meet them with the winning solicitations and persuasive accents of tenderness and compassion. Yes, I say, the above illustration, too aptly and powerfully, has place here, and, therefore,

instead of meeting our congregations with the coarse and vulgar, if not actually the sour and detrimental fare of the law, we should meet them with the *bons bons*, and sugar-plums of Gospel attraction and seduction; even "the exceeding great and precious promises" which are given to believers for this express purpose—viz., of reaching unto the negative and positive holiness required of the saints in Christ, even that of escaping the "corruption which is in the world by lust," and becoming "partakers of the divine nature."

But it will be asked me, is the minister to forbear threatening altogether, and where then goes the command given to Timothy, "to rebuke and to admonish," as well as to exhort; and the other denunciations scattered throughout the epistolary parts of the Scriptures? I answer, such may be very well to bring forward in private against a brother or a sister, who may be walking disorderly; but they are quite unfitting our public addresses to any general congregation. With regard to cases like the former, our blessed Saviour has left on record his directions—*e.g.*, in Matt. xviii. 15-17—"Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." As likewise Paul, with regard to the case of the incestuous person, as recorded, (1 Cor. v.), but even as regards a matter of such gross delinquency, Paul seems to relent, and completely to forgive. (See 2 Cor. v. 11.) But however severe our private reprimands of particular persons may be, I again re-assert, that such are quite unbecoming and inconsistent with our public pulpit discourses, excepting in the way of exhortations and warnings, calling upon them "to walk worthy of the vocation whereunto they are called." But how, I

ask, can ministers, with any show of reasoning, speak of the horrors of the eternal vengeance of God, or of the dangers of apostacy, or any such like subjects, to persons whom, a few minutes before, they addressed as "dearly beloved brethren," without a compromise of some of the leading and most precious comforting doctrines of the Gospel, such as, for instance, the final preservation of the Lord's people? Compare Romans viii. 29-39, with John x. 27-29.

A third subject, and the last that I shall here mention, (to carry on our military expression, as one of the saliant points for defence,) is, that which concerns the unconditional freeness of our justification in Christ. And I select this because that, however well protected "the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ," may be—however high the walls, and the bastions, and other munitions of protection, may be raised around upon every side—yet, if this one quarter be left unheeded and unguarded, the enemy will come in and destroy hereby the whole work of grace and of mercy, as effectually as though all other parts around the truth had been left quite open and without any barrier of opposition whatsoever; just as the neighbouring cattle can get through one level gap to destroy a field of corn, as well as if the field had been left without any fence at all around it. And here I would ask any plain and honest mind to determine how the unconditional freeness of the justification of the Gospel can be upheld and supported, when such qualifying conditions as faith and repentance are demanded by the sola-fidian systematisers of the word. There is every necessity, therefore, that we should reiterate our arguments, again and again, upon this point, that so, by repeated blows, we might infix the truth in the mind—"fastening it" as the "nail in a sure place." And we are called upon to a greater urgency here, on account of the insidiousness and

slyness by which the fatal error of Arminianism is apt to introduce itself amongst us; and never are these qualities more apparent than when it would come with all the plausibility and fair show of reasoning, as exhibited through the masterly pen of him whose work I have been here impugning. For faith, by the upholders of this system, is made at first so small—to wear so attenuated a form—being stripped of all its accompanying graces of “knowledge, temperance, brotherly kindness, charity,” with which being joined, it should always appear as the best furnished, the best conditioned grace amongst us. But instead of this comely, well-favoured virtue, behold as it is to appear before God for justification, it is to be reduced now to such skeleton proportions as to seem to be best represented by one of Pharoah’s lean kine, or by one of Charon’s denuded ghosts; for what otherwise means that most incomprehensible of all passages or descriptions—“And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God to be joined with faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying.” Forsooth, indeed, that such a spectre-like being, or that the very ghost of faith was quite enough to be presented before God in his office of justifying. But though faith is thus represented by the advocates of this system, as so small, so slender, so attenuated, so completely starved, desolate, and solitary, as scarcely to deserve the name of living faith at all; although so apparently meek, unassuming, diffident, modest, and retiring; yet, let it be permitted to get entrance for justification once before God, it soon throws off all disguise for such mock humility and want of pretension, and swells itself out to the very largest importance, so as almost to usurp the very place and office-character of Christ himself. (See page 114, and 60 of Bishop O’Brien’s Discourses.)

We may well apply, at least, a part of the beau-

tifully graphic description given of fame by Virgil in *Ænied*, 4, b. :—

“Fame, the great ill, from small beginnings grows
Swift from the first ; and every moment brings
New vigour to her flights, new pinions to her wings.
Soon grows the *pigmy* to *gigantic* size,
Her feet on earth, her forehead in the skies.”*

Yes, with all the assumption, at first of great modesty and humility, it is, after all, but the story of the thin edge of the wedge. The thin edge of the wedge has got in amongst us by the preaching up of “*fides sola*,” and unless we get it quickly out, it will be getting deeper and deeper, until, at length, it will split asunder, and break up, from its very foundations, our ecclesiastical polity. That I am not a Micaiah—a mere prophet of evil—on this occasion, I would refer to what tractarianism, through the instrumentality of this little leaven, (which, if not stayed, is likely to leaven the whole lump,) is doing in the sister kingdom ; as likewise the baptismal regenerationists, as also the whole of the high church party, who are trying to bring down the standard of divine truth to the level of the inferior interpretation of the prayer book, rather than to raise up that which the long prescription of years has discovered, (more especially by the light of the nineteenth century thrown upon it, to be erroneous in the prayer book,) to the lofty and infallible authority of the Scriptures. But, what is the remedy that I would propose, to resist this great evil ? I say, that if we would do good service for God in Christ to our own souls, and those of the congregations committed to our care, we must be neither afraid nor ashamed to revive and preach up, with a straightforward boldness and honesty, those deep mysteries of truth and of grace that have been too long

* “*Fama malum qua non aliud velocius ullum,
Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo
Parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras,
Ingrediturque solo, et caput inter nubila condit.*”

allowed to remain dormant and unheeded; we must not stand upon ceremony here, for fear of offending the delicate and susceptible ears of many of those who may be sitting under our respective ministries; but let them hear from our lips, openly and distinctly avouched, in their broad and plain terms, without anything of mental reservation or equivocation in the matter, the doctrines bound up in the seventeenth Article, together with the cementing ones of the federal headship of Christ, of our vicarious justification in Christ, &c.; for, in no other way that I can perceive, shall we be able to reveal the character of God, in its true Gospel-light, as that of the God of grace and mercy; in no other way shall we be able to hold up the doctrine of the unconditional freeness of redemption in Christ Jesus.

It will be said, that in following such directions, ministers will give such a tone of sectarian and puritanical doctrine to their preaching as would tend to disgust many of their present most staid and attentive hearers; and that hereby, instead of having the crowded congregations hanging on their lips for spiritual instruction Sabbath after Sabbath, the greater number being driven away by dislike, if not by very loathing, ministers would soon have to preach to comparatively empty benches. I answer, that ministers are not responsible for the numbers in their congregations; neither do such numbers always constitute a proof that we have the patronage of heaven on our ministry. We are only responsible for preaching the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus. And, moreover, I am persuaded that if we but hold up faithfully the Gospel as it stands exhibited through that great document of grace—the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ, along with the other deep mysteries of godliness enforced throughout this volume, as its necessary harbingers and accompaniments, we shall not only hereby drive out

all Arminianism and other errors from the minds of our hearers ; but these latter, although diminished as to numbers, becoming thus truly established in the faith, ministers shall have, in general, more real seals to their ministry than, perhaps, are now to be found among the over-crowded congregations attendant on the popular pulpits of the land. The Lord would then bless us as a Church, and would add to us daily such as should be saved ; or, as Christ said—" I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me"—that is, some out of all classes of men—viz., the promised seed, the elect Church. To illustrate this important point more distinctly, let us suppose we had before us a large heap of clay, and that amongst the clay was mixed up a certain quantity of the filings of steel, and that we had also a magnet of considerable power, let us only bring the magnet within a certain nearness to the body of clay, you shall immediately perceive some of the filings of steel getting into motion ; and as you apply the magnet closer and closer, so shall the steel-filings, leaving the clay, fly up and adhere to the magnet. And thus, as the experiment is oft tried, the clay being stirred up from time to time, all the filings may in due course be thus separated from it. Now, the filings represent those that are to be saved in Christ from amongst the general mass ; and Christ is the great spiritual magnet which is entrusted to our keeping to lift up, and to bring with closeness and frequency, to the people committed to our care. So far responsibility lies upon us ; but we can no more, by all our work and industry in preaching the Gospel ever so truly, make one believer, and thus cause one to be saved, than we could pretend, by any power of our own, to *create* one of the steel-filings as above described. "The Lord knoweth them that are his;" or to use the expressive imagery of Isaiah xlix. 16—"He has graven them on the palms of his hands, their walls are continually before him." Now, the first

of these images we may illustrate by that modern invention called stereotyping, which is a style of printing used, when any work of long-tried ability, and of popular reception with the public, is to be printed, not in the way in which common editions of books come forth in regular succession from the press; and when, as these are coming forth, the types are broken up, made ready in hand, for any other book for which they may be required; but according to this new process of printing, the types are permanently fixed, so as never to be broken up again. Thus, according to the above imagery of the prophet, we may say God has his people *stereotyped* on the palms of his hands. And the second imagery can be illustrated by an art which, if not a modern invention, has, at least, attained to such perfection in the hands of the Italians, as to be styled, after the language of their country, *fresco* painting; which is an art so devised as that the Italians can have the walls of their temples, now so covered with their drawings, under the influence of their serene and dry climate, as that time, so far from injuring, only indurates or hardens them. Thus the Italians, by this their ingenious devising, have this double advantage for their paintings; first, they have a permanence hereby given to them, the security for which is not, perhaps, to be equally insured to those celebrated ones which they have embodied on canvas, such being better protected from the effects of fire, and still more from being plundered by the invasion of a foreign enemy. Secondly—they seem to be capable of being thrown out into more bold relief than paintings done in the ordinary manner. But how poorly can the above, or any other illustration which we derive from the works of men, shadow forth the stability and prominency given respecting the most minute providences and histories of his people, by this remarkable expression of God through the prophet—"Thy walls are continually before me."

The Lord has, in every place, at every time, and in every congregation, his own people; and he will take care to bring each of these after his own way and manner within the sound of the preached Gospel of grace, that thereby they may have instrumentally produced in their souls his special gift of faith, whereby, when Christ is lifted up upon the Cross, they will flee and adhere to it, as tenaciously and as closely as ever steel-filings did to the powerfully applied magnet; and thus we shall have that Gospel expression (Acts xiii. 48) fulfilled—"As many as were ordained to eternal life believed;" in which expression we mark that it is not said, they believed in order to obtain eternal life, which is the general Arminian solafidian theorem; but, on the other hand, the converse of the proposition is the truth of God in this passage.

The virus of Arminianism consists in the indignity it puts upon the finished work of the atoning righteousness of Christ; God says in his Word, again and again, that the atonement has been accomplished, that his justice has been satisfied, his truth and holiness vindicated, his law made honourable, and everything, in fact, that infinite goodness, wisdom, and mercy could have accomplished, has been effected through the free, gratuitous redemption in Christ Jesus, for those for whom it was, in the eternal counsel of the Godhead, intended. That all this has been done without man's interference, or personal presence in the matter whatsoever. But proud man comes in and says, I am not satisfied with such an arrangement; I want to do something for my own justification before God; I want to have some part in the transaction; I do not like to be made a cypher of; I wish to be brought upon the stage, however meekly and humbly it may be; I proffer, therefore, my faith and my repentance for acceptance in this case. But God wants not such presumptuous intrusion on the part of faith and repentance; let these most useful and honoured graces keep

their proper and assigned position, and they will have quite enough to do to fulfil the important offices given them to perform in the economy of man's redemption. God likes not any meddling interference on man's part here; the whole attempt at such false intrusion is to introduce, as by a side-door, the abrogated system of the law; it is but the vain effort, to use the language of the Saviour, to "put the new piece upon the old garment, to put the new wine into old bottles," as though, forsooth, the old tattered, worn-out coat of Moses, which was, at best, but of temporary material and construction, could act as a suitable sub-stratum and foundation to support the new seamless vesture of Christ, made up altogether of heavenly material and manufacture; or as though the old, exciccated, dried-up, leathern bottles of the law could contain the new wine of the Gospel, fermenting as it was, with such high hopes, such richly abounding consolations, with such exceeding great and precious promises. Hence Paul's righteous indignation at the attempted indignity put upon his Great Master, when the Galatians wanted to tack circumcision, as a *sine que non* condition for justification. (Gal. iv. 3.) He cries out—"If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Paul could not, for a moment, admit that Christ should build upon another man's foundation; to make the religion of the Gospel a kind of joint-stock concern, as though Christ and Moses should enter into a co-partnership in making up this new religion. But the sola fidian theorists may say, we seek for no such unhallowed intervention on our part; we want not faith and repentance to come up with any of those pretensions that you ascribe to them; we wish to give Christ the whole merit of justification, as well as the most rigid Calvinist; hence we wish to have them, whatever place we declare them to hold, to assume the reality of modesty and humility as much as possible; the word merit we do not desire to have, by any means, joined

with them ; yea, we would wish to have faith, not to be considered as a work in this matter at all—to be a mere act of the mind, altogether separate from a work, in the way of prohibitory or mandatory command of law. But to this I answer, that no matter how retiring or modest a grace you may make faith to be, the great point of presumption after all is, a man saying that his presence is needed, where God peremptorily has commanded his exclusion ; so that if you come into the presence of God, with your minds as a *tabula rasa*, or mere blank, it would make no difference ; man's intrusion is the sin, and that according to the type observed upon must ever be avoided ; for suppose, under the law, a person to force himself into the tabernacle while the High Priest was performing his solemn service upon the day of atonement, under the promise that he would perform no work therein, nor speak a word, nor think even a thought, if such could be, could the service, under such circumstances, be continued contrary to the divine injunction ? (Lev. xvi. 17.) No ; the presence of the man would negative the whole service, and render a perfect nullity the important sacrifice to be made on behalf of the people. Just so, as the antitype, man must not presume to make any appearance at all in the matter of justification before God ; his Son has done all for us, the whole elect Church was covenanted for by Christ, even as all mankind have been covenanted for in Adam—that is, as all mankind were *en masse* in Adam for condemnation, so all the saved Church were in Christ *en masse* for justification unto life.

This is Gospel—real glad tidings of great joy. God is satisfied, and man, therefore, should be more than satisfied. “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.” Oh ! thrice blessed news ! we are justified, because Christ was justified in our place ; he undertook, indeed, for us that which we could never have undertaken or done for ourselves. He has been

the tested specimen of humanity, tried, put to the proof, and found perfect—"We are complete in him." We stand by representation before the Father; we have no personal appearance to make, no responsibility, no accountability here. I repeat, we roll all such upon Christ, and he has perfectly fulfilled all righteousness for us. This, I say, is real Gospel; and oh, that we could feel, for our spiritual rescue in Christ, something of the same feeling that came upon the ten thousand Greeks, when under their celebrated retreat, with Xenophon at their head, coming within sight of the Euxine Sea, they cried out, with one burst of universal acclamation, as knowing their deliverance was thereby at hand, "Thalassa, thalassa;" (the sea the sea;) or somewhat of the exuberant joy that burst forth from the mind of the celebrated mathematician of Syracuse, when, having discovered the solution of a much desired and most difficult problem, he ran out into the street, in the enthusiasm of his excited spirit—"Eureka, eureka," (I have found it, I have found it;) or if it be preferred to keep to the more sober dictates of Holy Writ, then may we be found possessing somewhat of the solid peace and holy rapture that came to the soul of Philip, when coming up to his brother Nathaniel, he cried out, in the extacy of his delighted spirit—"We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth." Yes, for believing in this one precious truth, we get at once into the true emancipation and liberty that is in Jesus Christ; thus, and thus alone, are we made to know the "things which are *freely* given to us of God." All other systems would put chains upon our legs, and then desire us to run the race; but by the above system alone, being free from all shackling conditions of legalism, all chains dissolved, except the chains of love in Christ, we run the way of God's commandments with delight.

Thus have we brought the Gospel within the very

narrowest bounds, the very easiest comprehension, and the very simplest construction; so that, truly, "he that runneth may read." To seek for justification in any of those other ways that would bring man more or less into the presence of his Maker for such purpose, is acting as incongruously and as directly against the divine commandment, as when the Jews, under the old law, would go to plough with the ox and ass together, or to sow their fields with divers kinds of seeds, or to wear the garments of forbidden texture. In a word, it is to offer the lamb for sacrifice unto God; and in no way can Christ be more insulted, or more indignity be put upon his already finished undertaking.

In fine, then, I would call upon all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, to come up with me here to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Let us all rise up, as with the heart of one man, and, taking up the sword of the Sprit, let us cut asunder the tap-root of this tree of evil, which has too long been overspreading, with its poisonous shade, the national Church and our whole kingdom. Let us, with the sling and the stone of the Word, go and meet the monster power of Arminianism—the spiritual Goliath*—that has been too long defying the armies of the living God; or let the same spirit animate us that animated the breast of the Roman patriot of old, who cried out, with valorous determination to root out the great enemy of his country—"Delenda est Carthago." Or, to give a Scriptural illustration, it is recorded that the Jewish women used to light candles and to search into the smallest corners and crevices of their rooms, in order that no leaven might be found in their habitations during the days of unleavened bread; so may we, praying that the candle of the Lord be so lighted

* I would wish to apply here to Arminianism the celebrated line of the Latin poet, and describe it as—*Monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*. N.B.—"Not a single ray of spiritual light ever comes into the soul of man through the inlet of Arminianism."

up in our souls, discover the very least portion of this old leaven of malice and wickedness, (call it legalism, Arminianism, self-righteousness, or under whatever nomenclature it may be placed,) and cast it from us with all loathing and alienation of mind—with all holy promptitude and determination, as that which derogates from the honour due to Christ, as that which mars the finished work of his atonement, as that which nurtures the pride of man's evil nature, and as that which is the enemy of all peace and of all godliness in his soul.

END OF RECAPITULATION.

CONCLUSION.

FROM the course of continuous reasoning adopted in this volume, it must, by this time, at once appear how the justification of the believer is one altogether apart from all human obedience, past, present, or to come ; or, to use the language of the schools, that we are justified independently of all works of “ antecedence, co-existence, or of consequence ;” and, therefore, that justification, as far as man is concerned, must be perfectly free, gratuitous, and unconditional. Hence the righteousness that justifies before God is never called the righteousness of man, but always, emphatically, the righteousness of God ; and it is called the righteousness of God, as being that righteousness which was wrought by him in human nature, who was—great is the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh, and who, therefore, is expressively called “ the Lord our righteousness.” Again : this righteousness is called the righteousness of God, as being a righteousness planned by God the justifier—accomplished by God the satisfier, and to be applied by God the sanctifier. For what have we really discovered the justification of true believers in Christ to be ? Believers stand accepted before God, not on account of what they are, or can do in themselves, but on account of what Christ has done for them ; they are treated as righteous, not on account of any righteousness of faith which they may individually themselves possess, however perfect such faith may be, but solely by that righteousness which Christ has effected for them. Believers have no righ-

teousness of their own to stand before God for justification ; but they have had an all-abounding righteousness in Christ, their federal head, for such justification before God. Believers have no personal righteousness for justification ; but they have a forensic righteousness for such in Christ. They have no righteousness in fact or in character for such purpose ; but they have an official righteousness in Christ for such purpose. They have no inherent righteousness, or, as we say, *ad intra*, for justification ; but they possess an external righteousness, or one *ab extra* in Jesus Christ. They have no plea of merit in themselves ; but they have an all-prevailing plea in Christ. In a word, they have no individual righteousness before God ; but they have a vicarious righteousness in Christ : in themselves spiritually bankrupt, by reason of their standing in Christ they have become rich with all unsearchable riches ; in themselves possessing no spiritual property, in Christ they have all and abound ; in themselves only children of wrath, in Christ they have become children of adoption and grace ; in themselves earning but a title to hell, in Christ they have become possessed of a title to heaven ; in themselves but heirs of damnation, in Christ they have been made heirs of glory.

Such, then, stands forth that great doctrine of the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ ; no mere refined speculation—no barren dogma, or figment of the schools ; but a doctrine which is the life-blood of the whole Christian system—the grand trunk and leading artery of all vital and evangelical Christianity ; a doctrine so replete with Gospel, that if it be lost, then all Gospel is lost ; a doctrine that is the very pillar and ground of truth—the chief corner-stone of all godliness and of all salvation—the sure and only true foundation ; so that as we are building on this, or adopting any other doctrine as its substitute, we are building either on the rock or on the quick-sand. The doctrine of the vicarious justification in Christ is the very

seminal principle of all grace and every Christian virtue; it is, moreover, the only source of all true, abiding peace and joy; it is the fountain of living waters opened out for believers in Christ, and flowing forth, for all mercy and favour, to their souls. Verily, verily, it is impossible for any language to exaggerate, or by any illustration to describe, the complete blessedness and importance of this great doctrine; for it is one of those essential truths that has all living power in it; it is the very "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." This doctrine of the vicarious substitution in Christ is the very passage from death unto life; it forms, so to speak, the spiritual suspension-bridge thrown across the otherwise impassable gulf of sin and damnation. When we contend for the doctrine of vicarious justification, we contend for no vain or notional scheme—for no jejune or hungry theorem—for no mere formal or secondary truth; but we contend for the very truth and life itself; we are contending, as we say, "*pro aris et focis*"—for the whole substance of our religion—for its entire property and essential existence; for we are contending for the "faith once delivered to the saints." The doctrine of the vicarious justification in Christ is the very ark of the believer's safety—the city of his refuge—his great and spiritual Zion; it is the very choicest of heaven's gifts—the Christian's most glorious inheritance—his loudest boast, and his greatest solace. In a word, it is his "all in all;" for virtually it is Christ himself—Christ formed in his heart by "faith, the hope of glory."

As the doctrine of vicarious justification in Christ is at once the most essential and the most embracing of all doctrines, forasmuch as it forms the sun of the whole evangelical system—all other doctrines, in harmonious orbits, moving around it in greater or lesser concentric circles; so is it also the most ancient, the most venerable, and the most august of all doctrines. It was this, though not in so many words but rather its correlative—"the doctrine of grace," no question, that formed the theme

which, in the patriarchal by-gone days, long, long since departed, attuned the harps of all the worthies before the flood; it was the song taken up anew by the saints in after times—by all the prophets under the old, the Mosaic, dispensation. In the hands of the apostles it formed notes of clearer cadence—of livelier, of more fervent, if not of more divine inspiration; later still it found the melody, and elevated the praises of all the faithful, even of the whole army of martyrs, confessors, and of all the elect in the whole Christian economy of love; and in time to come it shall be the glorious and everlasting song that shall swell the anthem of all the redeemed in glory, throughout all the countless ages of eternity itself. The “harpers, harping with their golden harps,” shall make heaven’s high arches ring, whilst they strike their notes afresh to the everlasting triumph of this great doctrine of grace, and of which it shall form the loud, the full, and the harmonious diapason.

That popular stanza would seem here to be appropriate:—

“Grace, ’tis a charming sound,
 Harmonious to the ear;
 Heaven, with the echo, shall resound,
 And all the earth shall hear.”

“There are various sounds in nature all plaintive and sad: the voice of winds, the chime of waves, and the song of birds, are all in the *minor* key, as if all creation groaned and travailed in pain, waiting for deliverance, which is the burden of prophecy, when the great Composer shall transpose all her strains from the *minor* into the *major*, and the wild wail of nature shall give way to the glad harmony of the everlasting jubilee, the joyous strains of which shall reverberate from heaven to earth, and the wide universe be as a whispering gallery, ever repeating its sweet music.”*

* Dr. Cumming, Benedict., p. 23.

I remember two occasions when the powerful effect of the united sound of music seemed quite overcoming. The one was at the close of Handel's *Messiah*, in the Cathedral of Worcester, when, after enjoying the charm previously of very fine music, suddenly the concluding "halleluiah chorus" came thundering on the ear from upwards of three hundred instrumental performers, (there were three concert bands united on the occasion,) each playing at the highest key of concert-pitch, with all the power which their respective instruments enabled them to reach unto. The effect truly was quite electrifying and overwhelming.

The second was at the anniversary exhibition of ten thousand charity children, assembled in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. This was a sight truly worth seeing; it was one which, if once witnessed, could never be forgotten, even to the very last day of human existence. But what produced the glory of that great scene? Was it the ten thousand children seated before you, on elevated benches, around the beautiful and wondrous dome of this vast structure, dressed out in their new clothes or uniforms, with their various facings indicative of the various establishments to which they respectively belonged? This was a glorious sight truly; but it was not that which formed the crowning glory of the day. Was it the thousands, or the ten thousands, or, as I was informed, a hundred thousand human beings filling up every niche and crevice of the vast area? Or was it the number of royal personages on that occasion assembled, with secretaries of state, foreign ambassadors, and noblemen beyond all count? Or was it the peculiar character of the preacher? (it was the good and celebrated Bishop Heber, preaching his first sermon after his appointment to the episcopate of India, that I had the privilege of hearing that day)—yes, it is with emphasis I say *hearing*; for having got, through the influence of a particular ticket which I possessed, my seat near the royal

box, I could hear every word of the sermon distinctly. Now one and all these, constituted privileges which it was of no common order to witness; but it was not until the time of the singing of the Psalm—it was the Hundreth Psalm, with Luther's simple but sublime tune, that was then most judiciously, on account of its simplicity, selected for the day—when the master of the choir elevating his baton—he lifted it and depressed it at every note—the ten thousand voices broke with thnnder on the ear, with such a crash of vocal sound, as to make people involuntarily leap from their very seats, and which had such a vibrating effect upon the surrounding air, that one might think the very dome of the mighty edifice would be lifted up from its foundations. Yes, it was the simultaneous burst of ten thousand voices, singing the praises of the great, infinite, and eternal Creator of the universe—of that God who declares that he “dwelleth not in temples made with hands, for that heaven is his throne, and that the earth is his foot-stool;” it was this that caused the crowning glory of the day, and it was this, moreover, which made Alexander, the Emperor of Russia, declare, that of all the sights which had been selected for his inspection, none gave him so great an idea of the moral grandeur of England, as the aggregate annual assembly of her charter-school children, and those of other charitable institutions in the Metropolitan Church of London.

But what idea can these combinations of earthly sound—even suppose they could be increased in a hundred or a thousand-fold—give, in the way of the very smallest perception, of the multitudinous amount of harmonious utterance that shall take place, when the Lord shall come, in his second glorious advent, to take possession here of his throne, as King of kings and Lord of lords; when “the ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands” of his redeemed and glorified saints—even that countless multitude,

that "no man can number, gathered out of all nations and kindreds, and people," shall raise their hallelujah anthems of praise to that God that redeemed them with his own blood; and when the harmonious chorus shall be taken up, not merely by ten thousand voices within the area of a building, pronounced huge, as being made by hands; but when thousands of millions of voices from the earth, (for the whole world then shall be turned into one universal temple, wherein all being brought to "know the Lord, from the least to the greatest," the praises of Emmanuel shall sound from pole to pole,) shall send up the utterances of their adoration, in accents made miraculously vocal, to their great Lord and Saviour enthroned on high. But what use is there in labouring after the description of that which baffles, not only all human language to represent, but all human imagination to form the remotest estimate of. For had I an hundred tongues, and these the tongues of angels, it would be impossible, even with the eloquence of heaven, to give the perception of that sublime grandeur, of the chorus of universal nature made resonant in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, with the congratulatory plaudits to Him that shall come then to reign amongst his saints gloriously, to be saluted as the Mighty Conquerer of Satan, sin, hell and death. When all creation, according the 150th Psalm of Jubilee, shall be called upon to praise God, not only in his "sanctuary here below, but also in the firmament of his power above." When, not only all the voices of the redeemed shall join to swell the universal harmony, each individual according to the gift of tune and compass bestowed upon him for the purpose; but when the whole band of instruments ever invented shall then also be brought forward to make up the effect of such a concert, as never never resounded, perhaps, before through the great expanse of immensity. For, at this marvellous time,

when everything "that hath breath" then praise the Lord for "all his mighty acts, and according to his excellent goodness," they shall be called according to the language of the Psalm quoted above, to "praise him with the sound of trumpet; to praise him with the psaltery and harp; to praise him with the timbrel and dance; to praise him with the stringed instruments and organs; to praise him with the loud-sounding cymbals;" and, in a word, with every other instrument of musical power, (which the inventive genius of man had got together,) for the purpose of eliciting or inviting the harmony of sweet sound, all, all to give glory to Him who comes to reign amongst his redeemed, as the great eternal God, unto whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, all praise, and honour, and worship shall then be universally acknowledged to be justly due from all men, all angels, and all creatures, for ever and ever.

Surely if Peter could say of the symbolic and momentary representation of all this in the mount of transfiguration, it was good for him, with his brethren, to be there; what mind is capable of portraying, even in the very remotest degree, what the actual reality of the future scene of the undefined millennial glory shall be, when that splendid city, not made with hands, "whose maker and builder is God;" upon which the great Architect of the universe would seem to concentrate all his skill, ingenuity, and power; and that also for a long period, to render it a fit habitation for him who, as his co-equal Son, amidst the congratulatory shoutings of angels and arch-angels, and the multitudinous host of his redeemed saints, is coming to be "crowned Lord of all."

I return now from the subject-matter of the hope of the Gospel, to the subject-matter of the faith of the Gospel; for the second advent is to my hope, what the first advent is to my faith. Neither let any persons think that I do wrong by coming back, once more, to

the great theme that has occupied me throughout this volume—even the vicarious justification of sinners in Christ—as though I might injure the doctrine by the repeating it too often, and by overlaying it with too many arguments and illustrations. Nay, I would say, it is not easy to do this before any mind that feels itself altogether “to grace so great a debtor.” Like the beautiful carpet of nature spread around us on the brilliant summer’s day, this great doctrine of grace must ever come before the true believer’s soul with refreshing newness and verdure; or like the beautiful transcendental symbol of covenant-mercy which, in itself, is so glorious an object to gaze upon, that no eye, of any refinement or sensibility, can ever allow it to fall upon the sight.

O blessed truth, that like the guiding star which directed the steps of the Magi of old to where the new-born Saviour lay, wherever Jesus is, there, to the believer in him, thou ever art. Thou that hast hitherto (however *partially* revealed) borne our national Church, unscathed and uninjured, through all the fiery persecutions of ages past—thou sovereign soother of all earthly woes, by thy enlightening, comforting, and strengthening influences, didst carry her ancient martyrs and confessors rejoicing to the burning stake, causing them to hug and glory in the very faggots, whose fierce and vivid flames were soon to consume their tortured bodies—thou that didst convert the devouring element, so to speak, into a chariot of glory, to carry their souls, Elijah-like, into mansions of eternal bliss—be present in all thy pure, and pristine, and unshorn strength, to bear her up safely still in those eventful—those latter days of her great peril and alarm—this coming crisis of her agony and her conflict—above all the endurances and distresses, the offences and antagonisms of this the dispensation of her temptation and of her hardship—of her labour and of her sorrow. Above all, may our national Church

now, even at the eleventh hour, selecting thee as her watch-word and beacon, through thee remain unse-duced by all modern formalism and heresy—by all fond and vainly invented figments and tradi-tional innovations, as well as also by all unscriptural liberalism and Sadducean philosophy; may she cling to thy precious substance and thy power—to thy foundation truth, and to thy testimony, as to the very centre of all her confidence—the nucleus of all her joys, and the very sheet-anchor of all her hope, and of all her salvation. O may she never let thee go, but by the loss of all her physical strength—yea, with nought but with the loss of her very life itself. O, soul-sustaining, soul-animating, soul-refreshing doctrine.—
“*Esto perpetua, esto universa.*”*

* See Note Q.

THE END.

NOTES.

NOTE A, Page 2.

"The Verbal Inspiration."

It had been my intention to give rather a full analysis of the leading arguments used in support of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, as also of the various objections taken against this system; such as, for instance, from our not possessing the inspired text to refer to, and our being, therefore, obliged to have recourse to translations; of the multiplied readings and errors to be found in those translations—errors in the narrative, and errors as to facts—errors contrary to the philosophy of nature, &c. Objections taken from the avowals of Paul, (1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, &c.,)—from the use of the Pentateuch—from the non-necessity for the use of inspiration of well-known historical details, of trivial events, and other subjects of this kind. Now these, however interesting and important their discussion might prove, I am obliged to omit, on the ground of prudence, not wishing to incur the risk of much additional cost, having originally named too low a price for my book. I must, therefore, content myself by directing my readers to some of the more eminent modern writers on these subjects, more especially such as may have come within my own information and reading—"It is Written," by Professor L. Gaussen. "Divine Inspiration," by E. Henderson, D.D. "The Norrisian Prize Essay." 1849, by Rev. R. Whittington.

NOTE B, Page 22.

"Reorganize."

From this expression it will immediately appear, that I fall in with the theory of the geologists, who assign a period to the creation of the world long, long before that assigned by Moses for the creation of man. I shall endeavour to give the evidence for the great antiquity of the earth, as concisely and plainly as I can.

First—geologists, from finding that, for every forty-five feet they descend into the earth, Fahrenheit's thermometer rises one degree, conclude that, from fifty to sixty miles downwards, the heat would reach to such height of progressive intensity, as to melt the very hardest flint-stone rocks. From hence they come to the conclusion, that the internal part of this globe is one vast ocean of fire, and that, therefore, that the earth, instead of having one solid mass of earth and rock throughout, has but an outward crust or shell of a certain comparatively small thickness. And Professor Hitchcock supposes, therefore, that "the time was when the whole

matter of the earth was in a melted state, and not improbably also even in a gaseous state."

Again: geologists have discovered, that when God wanted to make the earth a fit habitation for man, he did not separate the outward crust from the raging, fiery fluid within, all at once, but that it took an amazing previous process of time—say hundreds of thousands of years—to bring the earth to its present state of comparative perfection. And they come to this conclusion from discovering that this outward crust is not composed of one kind of matter, however varied throughout, but that it is made up of several regular successive layers, superinduced one upon the other, like the scales of a fish, or of an onion, or like the laminae (the technical term) of a coat of mail. Again: they have discovered, that the beds of such laminae are composed of quite different materials; and that these beds must have taken an indefinite period of time to have reached to their present thickness. Geologists enumerate six of these stratified layers.—First, or at the lowest foundation of all, is the hard, sparkling, crystallised granite; this layer is altogether of undefined thickness. Secondly, we have next in order, that which geologists term the layer of gneiss, or whinstone, which, being analysed, is found to be of the same substances as the granite—namely, of mica, felspar, and quartz. But, moreover, this layer, which is found sometimes in blocks of three hundred feet perpendicular thickness, was not created all at once, but seems to have been produced somewhat after the following manner:—A deluge of waters would appear to have played over the surface of the hard face of the granite, so as to have ground some of it to powder, and thus to have deposited it in the way of detritus or mud, upon its surface, in layer after layer, or lamina upon lamina, and that by most gradual and slow degrees, as it is proved that one layer must have become hardened, to use Dr. Cumming's simile—"had been the scene of long traffic like a turnpike-road;" and this detritus, or mud, must have come gently and softly upon the hardened cake below, since even the "foot-prints of birds and of beasts—yea, and the marks of leaves, and the ripple of the waves, washing, wasting, and rubbing it," may be seen transferred from the lower hard surface to the upper one immediately above it; and this is true of all the fossiliferous strata; which strata, by the process of superimposition, is found to reach unto even nine miles of perpendicular height. Thirdly—the next layer after the gneiss, is that which is called the Silurian, or coral beds, which are sometimes of three hundred feet in height, which, when you take into consideration two other facts, as proved by geologists, respecting these coral formations, will demonstrate that these beds must have consumed a vast amount of time in their composition. The first fact is, that these coral beds are made of the secretions of little animals; and the second fact is, that they only increase in the ratio of six inches in every hundred years. Fourthly—The next layer is that of the red sand-stone. Fifthly—Next in order is the carbonaceous layer, or that of the coal beds, of which the following facts have been proved:—First, that some of the coal beds in England have been discovered to be upwards of three hundred feet in thickness. Secondly, that such coal beds are made out of peat-moss, and that this peat-moss has itself been made out of large forests of pine, beech, oak, &c. And, thirdly, that such process requires tens and tens of thousands of years for its development, and transformation into real, perfect coal. This latter fact is now

deriving its demonstration from a peat-moss, near Stirling, in Scotland, which is known to have been a forest two thousand years ago, from some Roman remains that have been discovered in it, and which peat-moss is now being carbonized, but which, from the slow progress at which it has hitherto been advancing, would take at least ten thousand years to be converted into coal. Sixthly, and lastly—The next layer is the alluvial deposit, that now covers the surface of the earth, and in this layer alone the remains of any human beings have been found; which fact testifies, beyond all power of refutation, that the account given by Moses of man's creation, say six thousand years ago, (I speak in round numbers,) is correct. Thus geology, so far from subverting the description of the reorganization of this earth, (as a place made suitable for the habitation of man,) and of man's creation, &c., as told by Moses, comes up in evidence of the Mosaic record, and so far from subverting, adds additional force, if such were, indeed, by any means required, to the truth of the inspiration of the Word of God.

I might add, that along the fossiliferous strata already mentioned, there are also the "beds of lime-rocks connected with the coal deposits, as well as the various ores of iron, of gold and silver, thrown out in veins and interstices in the rocks; all necessary for the use and comfort of man. If you had no lime, you would have no flux for melting the metal; if you had no coal, you would have no fire to melt the metal; and if you had no metal, you would not require the lime and the coal; and yet, all three are generally contiguous. Again: the lime is composed of dead sea shells and insects."

Such, then, are the six regular beds, or stratified layers, that by the process of super-imposition which would be found uniformly, or in regular succession, composing the crust of the earth, if such had not been broken up in unnumbered ways by the various deluges, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and other disturbing forces which have played upon this outward shell, during the hundreds of thousands of years of its conformation; and which have thrown these beds, in various places, into such interminable confusion, as to render geology, after all, practically, a difficult and involved science.

Another argument for the great antiquity of the earth is to be derived from the several successive races of organized beings that have existed from age to age upon it. Some standard writers make the numbers of these periods of existence to be as many as twelve; but Professor Hitchcock reduces them to five. Now, Mr. Miller states, that "each successive dynasty was created at its maximum of perfection, and that degradation, not elevation, has been the law of existence; we find no instance of the transformation of races in geology." (Miller's Footprints of the Creator.) The argument for the earth's antiquity, from the above consideration, is derived from the "great groups of animals and plants, so completely independent, that no species whatever is found in more than one of them;" each of which "should have lived, and successively passed away, before the creation of the races that now occupy the earth's surface." "Comparative anatomy testifies that so unlike in structure were these different groups, that they could not have existed in the same climate, and other external circumstances."—(Hitchcock, p. 85.)

Such, then, are the detailed, but still, of necessity, abbreviated arguments

for the great antiquity of the earth. Two or three short observations must conclude this note, already drawn out to a length which I should have desired to have avoided if possible. The first observation refers to the answer to be given to those, who would object against the inspiration of Scripture, from the apparent disparity between the account given by Moses of the cause of death, as originating in the sin of Adam, and the existence of this dire evil, by the passing away of whole generations of existences, previously to the creation of Adam. The answer to this question is to be found in that mysterious one, the origin of sin; and I agree with Dr. Cumming,* (to whom I refer my readers, for satisfactory answers to this and other difficulties connected with the subject now under consideration,) that this is given in Jude vi., from which passage we discover that sin existed, and, therefore, death, as the consequence of sin, long before the account recorded by Moses of the re-organization of this globe for the habitation of man.

Another observation is, that so far from looking with terror upon those volcanic eruptions, which we find here and there upon the earth, we should look upon them rather as so many safety-valves, which God, in his providence, has provided, to prevent the internal ocean of fire, within the body of the earth, from bursting through its shell, and at once involving the whole surface, with its inhabitants, in one universal ruin.

And the last remark I make is, that we see how ready, at command, God has prepared, within the bowels of the earth, that which is to execute his final judgment, in causing that complete conflagration which is fore-ordained mainly to burn up the heavens and the earth. Nevertheless, we, as Christian believers, may take to ourselves that consolation arising from the command ninety-nine times given in the words—“*fear not*,” inasmuch as we are desired, with Christian hope, to anticipate a “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

NOTE C, Page 28.

“Made of one blood all nations of men.”

There is no subject that has been more prolific in calling forth the taunts and scoffs of infidels, than that contained in the above text. How, then, say they, are we to account for the infinite variety of languages? Can these all be traced up to one source? Or, again, what as to the infinite variety of the human countenance—for instance, from the oval-faced and Grecian-modelled features of the beautiful Circassian and the comparatively deformed Mongul and Negro conformations of visages and skulls? or, again, as to the fair European and jet black Negro complexion? How can these all be supposed, to have one common origin—to have been derived from Adam alone? And, again, the infidel asks, in triumph, when not only the large continents of the world have been found inhabited with more or less of the human family dispersed over them, but also the most remote and sequestered of the Polynesian islands have been discovered not unpeopled, by what process of emigration can we account for such mysterious groupings of the human family?—emigrations, according to the above Scripture system, undertaken without the advantage of any regular ships, or charts, or compasses—emigrations which must have thrown those of the adventurous expeditions of Columbus and

* Lecture—Genesis and Geology.

Americus Vesputius into the shade. These and such like questions are constantly put, from time to time, by the opposers of religion, to try and shake Christianity to its very foundation; but I am happy to say, that as the science of ethnology becomes more and more developed, the more these difficulties seem to be removed; and notwithstanding all the first-eight intricacies of such matters, yet are they obtaining an easy and demonstrable solution by the deep-thinking investigators of the above science. I had intended to enter on an analysis of the arguments derived from ethnology, to support the above text; but I find that the subjects embrace so large a circumference, as could by no means be included within the very limited space which I have assigned for the present notes; so that I prefer to direct my readers to investigate these matters for themselves; and I would here take the opportunity of recommending for their perusal "Twelve Lectures on the connection between Science and Revealed Religion," by the *self-styled* Cardinal Wiseman. And here I would ask them to forego any prejudice which might exist in their Protestant minds towards so prominent a Romanist as the Cardinal—a prejudice, I acknowledge, that existed in my own mind when the volumes were first put into my hands; but a prejudice which at once gave way as I went forward in the details of the work—a work replete not only with demonstrative facts, which refute the objections, as here alluded to, made by infidels, but a work filled with vast research of information and learning for every person of deep and inquiring intelligence. The cardinal in the advertisement to the third edition regrets his being obliged to discontinue his cultivation of literature; we, Protestants, must regret, on the other hand, to see a mind so capable of grasping the erudite problems of science, so misdirected in propping up the puerilities, not to give a harsher term, of a system so cramping to the free exercise of reason and learning, as that which he is now engaged in.

NOTE D, Page 27.

The sanctions annexed for obedience or disobedience, Ezekiel xviii., seem merely to refer to the temporary ones belonging to the Jew, under the covenant of works, and are by no means to be transferred to the covenant of grace. My argument here is as follows:—That God would seem to me to have superseded, in the case of his people Israel, the condemnation in Adam; and that with all consistency; forasmuch as the condemnation in Adam arose from his having been placed under a covenant of works; so God, having re-established, with his people Israel, the covenant of works upon a larger and broader basis, left against them the same sanctions for obedience and disobedience which he had assigned to our first parent, promising them life upon their perfect obedience—"do this and thou shalt live;" but bringing them under a personal condemnation for the infraction of the very least of the conditions, declaring—"cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them." Hence, the power of God's reasoning with his people in the opening part of the chapter, in reply to the objecting Jew, who says—"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." God answers the objection by stating, not that the death of any Jew was caused by reference to the sin of his father, nor even to that of the great father of all mankind; but he declares he puts the sanction of the law upon a new footing with

regard to them, saying—"the soul that sinneth it shall die." Now, as no Jew was found able to keep up to the perfect standard that the law demanded, no Jew obtained life by the law; and, therefore, every Jew, when dying, must lay the cause of his death, not at the door of the sin of another, as the Christian can do under the Gospel of grace, but he must lay it at the door of his own personal transgression; and hence the power of that expression of the Apostle—Heb. ii. 15.

In making the above remarks I must not be brought in guilty under the clause of Article Seven, which condemns those who would "feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises," forasmuch as in the above paragraph, I use the law merely as that which was brought in parenthetically as the temporary, *national* covenant, but as by no means superseding that great covenant of grace originating with the first promise, and which was to stream down through all dispensations to the end of time, embracing within its blessed volume all those who were to be saved according to the election of grace, throughout every age of the Church.

NOTE E, Page 30.

I by no means must be supposed to be desirous here to intimate anything concerning the eternal destiny of our first parent, whom I humbly trust, with the charity that "hopeth all things," would, with his partner, be found amongst the remnant "saved according to the election of grace;" though I acknowledge that the Scriptures seem industriously and mysteriously silent on the matter. (compare Heb. xi., &c.)

NOTE F, Page 94.

I had intended to enter here on the question so much at issue among theologians, but the want of space forbids my doing so; and, indeed, such would seem to be less necessary, on account of the subject having been taken up by writers in the *Christian Examiner* not very long since, and having received at their hands its fullest vindication. To this publication I now refer any persons who may desire a full elucidation of this "questio vexata." I shall only add, in passing, that the words "it is finished," have no reference, according to their context, to the perfecting of the work of atonement, to which they are so often misapplied, but to the prophecies referring to his crucifixion as having been then all accomplished.

NOTE G, Page 126.

In reference to the paraphrase of Rom. iii. 19-28, as brevity must here be consulted, as well as in the former notes, there are but three or four points that demand any particular explanation; for the rest, I must refer my readers to such popular commentaries as those of Scott, Fry, &c. The first, and by far the most important point, is that which determines the meaning of the words "deeds of the law" in this paragraph; forasmuch as if I can prove that these words cannot, in any respect, relate to the fruits of faith, I hereby overturn the whole sola fidian system from its very foundation. Now, the first time this remarkable expression meets us is in verse 20, where the apostle draws this conclusion from his previous premises, that, "therefore,

by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified" in God's sight. Now, what are the premises from which he draws such a conclusion? The apostle divides all mankind into two parties—Gentile and Jew. First he takes the Gentile and tries him by the law of *natural* conscience, (see chap. ii. 12-16,) and brings him in as convicted of transgressing its dictates; and then he takes the Jew and tries him by his *revealed* law, and proves him equally a delinquent; and thus bringing in the whole world "guilty before God," he draws the above conclusion. Here, then, the words "deeds of the law" can have no reference whatsoever to the fruits of faith; forasmuch as the Gentile had no such principle operating within him; neither could the carnal, proud, self-justifying Jew, against whom St. Paul is here maintaining his argument, be said to be influenced by faith, any more than the poor ignorant heathen. Now, whatever meaning these remarkable words—"the deeds of the law"—have in this passage, the same, by all fairness of interpretation, they must have in the whole paragraph; but here they cannot mean the fruits of faith, but merely those works either done by the heathen, as the results of their obligation to the law of nature, or the works done by the Jew, as the results of his obligation to the law of Moses. We would say the apostle, in the passage, is confining himself to the latter meaning, as his argument is drawn to suit the case, for the conviction of the self-justifying, Pharisaic Jew. The apostle draws the same conclusion in the twentieth and twenty-eighth verses; but he comes to it in each case from *different* premises. In the first, or at the twentieth verse, he comes to the conclusion, that "a man is justified without the deeds of the law," from the consideration of the impossibility of his obeying the moral precepts of law, by reason of the corruption of man by nature; and at the twenty-eighth verse he comes to the conclusion, that man "is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," from the consideration of God having provided a righteousness of his own, without man's interference or personal appearance in the matter.

We come, in the second place, to consider what the righteousness is that God has provided, whereby the sinner is to be justified. It is called "the righteousness of God," in direct opposition to any righteousness of man; "the righteousness of God without the law"—i.e., without the deeds of the law, as already observed upon in the twentieth and twenty-eighth verses; it is called "the righteousness without works," (Rom iv. 6,) and, therefore, without the work of *faith*. Indeed it must appear to be quite unfitting and indecorous for man, or for man's work, to be introduced at all as co-operating in that which God alone has undertaken to perform. (See pp. 135-140.)

We come, in the third place, to consider the position which faith holds in the work of the sinner's justification before God, as to be explained in the paragraph under consideration. At the twenty-eighth verse, St. Paul says, "A man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law;" and, in the fourth chapter eleventh verse, he denominates the righteousness of God as "the righteousness of faith." Now, if we go back with him to the first chapter and seventeenth verse, we shall find the reason and import of faith being introduced into the matter; for he says, "therein is the righteousness of God *revealed* from faith to faith." Faith, then is the window which the Spirit of God opens out to let in this great truth of God—this light of heaven's mercy and grace—into the otherwise dark chambers of the soul. But as I have explained my meaning on this subject so largely in my work, I need not go over the ground again here, and, therefore, refer my readers to

pages 179-197. There is but one verse more in this most vital paragraph of Scripture that I think it needful to say a few words in comment upon; it is the twenty-sixth verse—"To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." The remark I wish to make on this is, that faith is not to be considered as a cause, or reason, or condition, as my opponents would state, why God should justify the sinner; and that not only on account of the explanation I have now given of the use of faith in justification, as derived from the apostle's declaration in Rom. i. 17, but still more when we compare spiritual things with spiritual—the only way of coming to a true understanding on disputed points of doctrine. When we turn to Acts xiii. 48, we read therein, "As many as were *ordained* to eternal life *believed*"—that is, their faith was not a condition why they should obtain eternal life, but altogether the consequence of their being "ordained to eternal life." Faith can never be considered a reason with God why he should select any person to eternal life; forasmuch as faith itself is the great gift of heaven, (see Ephes. ii. 8, &c.,) bestowed only on those whom God, according to the seventeenth Article, "determined to deliver from curse and damnation," &c. Faith is a reason to the individual himself to know that he is one of those whom God, "in his counsels, secret to us," hath determined for eternal life. (See pp. 180-188.)

NOTE H, Page 192.

I wish to state here, first, that I use the word "Cameronian" in a popular sense, as applicable to Scotch Protestants of the Presbyterian denomination in general; and, indeed, the well-trying services of *any* faithful domestic are not intended by me, in my remarks in the above passage, to be limited, but may be supposed to include persons of any Protestant Church who may serve their masters from motives of strict Christian principle and fidelity; and of which valuable membership of the domestic constitution we have a most notable example given in "the history of Ruth Clarke, for 30 years servant of the late Rev. Henry Venn;" and about whom there is a tract published by the Religious Tract Society; and of which tract I would here take the opportunity of recommending the very wide circulation.

NOTE I, Page 210.

"*Arbitrary enactment.*"

It is a common objection made by the adversaries of religion to the doctrine of atonement, that it is altogether in the way of arbitrary enactment on the part of Deity; for that God might, by an act of amnesty, have at once forgiven his rebellious, sinful creatures. The answer to this is, that God must exercise his mercy in a way that may be consistent with the upholding of his own character, as the moral governor of the universe, and with the demands of his dishonoured, broken law; or, in other words, with the inviolability of the claims of justice; as the apostle states, Rom. iii. 26, "That he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." But again it is objected that the doctrine of atonement interferes with that of free forgiveness, as, *e.g.*, stated in the twenty-fourth verse of the same chapter—"Being justified freely through his grace, by the redemption which is in Jesus Christ; for how can it be free, when God asks the greatest price that his justice could have obtained?" The answer to this specious reasoning is to

be found by stating, that the God who demanded this mysterious price is the same as he who paid it; and, therefore, we have a most strong and conclusive, though indirect, testimony to the truth of the essential Deity of Christ.

But again, it is objected that it is contrary to the rules of justice amongst ourselves to have an innocent victim offered up in place of the guilty, and that no judge of assize could for a moment admit, if such a case were presented before him, that the brother, pronounced innocent in the sight of the law, should be allowed to substitute himself to undergo the final penalty of the law's sanction, in the place of his brother, found feloniously guilty, and awarded, accordingly, for execution. The answer to this objection is not to be found, as generally stated, in the voluntary dedication of Christ as an innocent victim for the atonement of the sins of a guilty world; for such would be contrary to our sense of justice, as in the illustration just given. The only way I can perceive of getting out of the difficulty is by stating, that though Christ *personally* was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," yet, by the doctrine of *imputation*, as Scripturally vindicated and explained, he was looked upon by God so far forth as guilty, and was dealt with accordingly. (Psalm xl. 12, and lxi. 4.)

NOTE K, Page 224.

"Christ-head."

It had been my intention to give an abstract of my view on this essential and mysterious truth, which the writer, to whom I refer my readers, has termed "the very seed-bed of truth, and the real encyclopedia," as far as the redemption in Christ is concerned. I, therefore, now direct them to the first of four very remarkable lectures, on subjects connected with prophecy, by the Rev. James Kelly, in which they will find the question most amply and satisfactorily vindicated; and I feel the greater pleasure in so doing, as it enables me to have the opportunity of recommending a volume which will most amply repay the deepest and closest perusal. I would only further remark, that if opportunity be given to me, I shall take up this question, for full discussion, in a future volume, along with many others of interest and importance, which the limits of the present work have obliged me to omit.

NOTE L, Page 227.

"The boundless Span of the Creation of Omnipotence."

I shall give one extract from the work of Sir David Brewster, called "More Worlds than One," in confirmation of the remarks in the above paragraph.—"As there is no such thing in the heavens as a rectilinear motion, it is evident that the sun, with all its planets and comets, is in rapid motion round an invisible body. To that now dark and mysterious centre, from which no ray, however feeble, shines, we may, in another age, point our telescopes, detecting, per-chance, the great luminary which controls our system, and bends its path into that vast orbit which man, in the whole cycle of his race, may never be allowed to round. If the buried relics of primeval life have taught us how brief has been our tenure of this terrestrial paradise, compared with its occupancy by the brutes that perish, the grand, sidereal truth which we have been expounding impresses upon us the no

less humbling lesson, that from the birth of man, to the extinction of his race, the system to which he belongs will have described but an *infinitesimal* arc in that grand cosmoical orbit in which it is destined to revolve. If reason ever falters beneath the weight of its conceptions, it is under this overwhelming idea of time and space. One round, doubtless, of this immeasurable path will the sun be destined to describe. How long a journey has it made in the past? How brief in the present? How endless in the future?

NOTE M, Page 232.

"Repentance towards God and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ."

I had intended to make an examination of the use of the word "repent," as it bears upon the doctrine of justification, in many passages in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles; but I feel the power, once more, of the check-rein, and, therefore, I must defer my remarks for my next volume which, being intended to be chiefly practical, such discussions will be more consonant to its subject-matter.

NOTE N, Page 262.

"Methodism."

In any remarks I may have made against Methodism, I wish to have it most distinctly understood, that such have been levelled against what I conceive to be untrue and unsound in the system, but not in the least directed against Methodists themselves. I war not against men, but against false opinions. I am the follower of Him who, whilst he is the "sinner's friend, is sin's eternal foe." Nay, on the contrary, I hold several Methodists in the very highest estimation; many of them have been, not only my acquaintances, but my close and most Christian friends. I shall conclude this note by relating an anecdote to the purpose. It is well known that George Whitfield and John Wesley were the heads of two opposing sets of Methodists in their day. The former was the head of the Calvinistic, and the latter of the Arminian Methodists. Between these parties there existed great virulence of feeling. Each used to dip his pen, betimes, in "the gall of bitterness." On one occasion, when the spirit of party and of rivalry ran high, a very starch and bigoted Calvinist came up to Mr. Whitfield, and put to him the question, did he think that when Mr. W. and himself were in paradise would they see John Wesley there? No, said Mr. Whitfield, I think we shall not. The rigid sectarist was going away rubbing his hands with delight, and about to tell his brother Calvinists of the famous answer of their great leader, when Mr. Whitfield, anticipating his leaving the room, called him meekly and affectionately back, and thus reproved him—"Do you know the reason, brother, why we shall not see John Wesley in heaven? He will be up so close to the shekinah of glory that surmounts the eternal throne, and shall be so wrapt up in the effulgence of light and of bliss, that we shall see but the halo of his lustre, not himself." I need not say how the theoretic Calvinist was brought down by the fine, Christian, and charitable observation of the true man of God—even of him who was emphatically styled "the Prince of Preachers" in his day.

NOTE O, Page 263.

"Ding dong ring."

I beg not to be misunderstood as though I would say one letter of a word in the way of disparagement of that man of God who comes over periodically to visit the sequestered districts of the West of Ireland, in order to examine the work which the zealous ministers under him are engaged in; or that I do not, from my heart, wish him, and those that are co-operating under him, God speed, and every blessing in their mighty and chivalrous undertaking. But though I do this, yet I deplore, and I must still think, that too much of *negative* teaching is carried on by means of controversial lectures, and still more by means of the instruction given through the instrumentality of Scripture-readers, most of whom seem merely qualified for the system of knocking down, but not building up. However, I am free to acknowledge the great difficulty that must have hitherto arisen from the impossibility of obtaining as many suitable persons as were all at once needed at the commencement of this most disinterested and enterprising "labour of love and work of faith." And I would, in conclusion, only say, that if the suggestions I have made in the passage above referred to tend, directly or indirectly, to make those who take a lead in the evangelic movement, now so auspiciously carried forward in the land, to give a more *positive* direction to the teaching henceforth carried on amongst us, I shall by no means regret having introduced the topic. And, at all events, I trust that any observations I may have made, shall not be so misinterpreted and misapplied, as to be supposed made in the way of personal attack against any of my devoted brethren, the least of whose shoes' latches I confess myself unworthy to unloose.

NOTE P, Page 268.

Mr. Addison, in his *Spectator*, has some beautiful remarks, how envy and jealousy need never get into the minds of the redeemed in glory, upon their first entrance, by seeing others advanced to higher eminence of distinction than themselves; forasmuch as he imagines that, according to the law of progression, there may be a continued advancement going forward through the endless ages of eternity itself, so that each of the redeemed may expect, in due course, to reach unto what was the highest eminence, when he was first introduced into glory; and yet those beings who are so much higher than he is in the scale of elevation, shall still be advancing forward, so as to keep up the proportional distances; and yet no approximation ever to be made towards the infinite mind itself.

NOTE Q, Page 326.

I have taken it for granted that the martyrs and confessors, and the worthies of ancient times, in substance, held this doctrine; which, in the judgment of charity, I have done on the following ground:—I have found that not a single person was martyred for the faith, (as far as my reading has gone upon the subject,) who did not hold the doctrine of Article 17, according to its moderate Calvinistic interpretation. Now, I maintain that none can do this, with any fair show of consistency, and hold to the latter

Z

part of Article 11, according to the view taken of it in my work; and that, therefore, if any of these worthies saw that it bore the Arminian interpretation which I have given of it, they never had consented to have allowed it a place amongst the public confessions and creeds of the Church. I do believe that many of them gave their sanction to its adoption either from long prescription and usage, or out of deference to the opinions of others, or else from not having brought their minds, from some cause or other, to bear with any weight of reasoning upon a fair and full analysis of the subject. However the matter may be explained, I am free to confess that those great men would as soon have put their hands into the fire, as subscribe to any tenet which they for a moment would think could sanction the putting of shackling Arminian conditions upon the doctrine of justification. I feel persuaded that they used the doctrine of justification by faith *alone* as a correlative of justification by grace. And the same judgment of charity I hold with regard to my evangelical brethren in the Church at the present day, that it is after somewhat of the above explanation that they would subscribe to the celebrated aphorism of Bishop Horsley—"That man is justified by faith without the works of the law, was the uniform doctrine of the first reformers. It is a far more ancient doctrine; it was the doctrine of the whole college of apostles. It is more ancient still; it was the doctrine of the prophets. It is older than the prophets; it was the religion of the patriarchs."

I am glad now in closing my present volume to take the opportunity of giving this my final explanation as to the object of the proposed controversy between my dear Christian brethren and myself. I should be sorry to make any remarks I have put forth in this work a ground of controversy, to excite anything like feelings of personal distaste, not to speak of enmity, between us. But far different is my view with regard to a controversy of opinions themselves; here I am always glad of an amicable collision; for as it is by the collision of two flint-stones that fire is elicited, so, when religious discussion is carried on in a proper Christian spirit, I expect to find some fire of spiritual vitality produced as the issue of such; and so I trust it may be on the present occasion. I hope that if I do not demonstrate truth, I shall be able to *elicit* it; and, therefore, in the spirit of love and kindness, as well as humility and meekness, I submit the arguments I have used to the charitable vindication of the Christian public.

* * That I do no injustice to Luther by holding him up as the great instrument of introducing Arminianism into the creeds and confessions of Protestant Churches, I refer my readers to Dr. Burnet's Preface to the Thirty-nine Articles, pp. 14-19, in which they will find Burnet dividing the two leading classes of the interpreters of Article Seventeen, into those of Lutherans and Calvinists.

Works

PUBLISHED BY JOHN ROBERTSON,

Agent for the London Tract Society's Publications,

3 GRAFTON-STREET, DUBLIN,

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., LONDON ; JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER,
EDINBURGH.

BY REV. J. M. HIFFERNAN.

SKETCHES FROM OUR LORD'S HISTORY 5s.

LIFE SKETCHES FROM SCRIPTURE. Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

"The piety, the zeal, the eloquence, and often the striking originality of his remarks have been widely acknowledged."—*Christian Observer*.

"Written with clearness and elegance of language. We look upon Mr. H. as one of the most useful and practical writers of the day."—*Statesman*

BY REV. F. F. TRENCH.

A HELP TO DEVOTIONAL EXERCISES during the Celebration of the Lord's Supper. Second Edition, 18mo. 6d.

THE RITE OF CONFIRMATION. 12mo. 3d.

ON THE NATURE AND PREPARATION for the LORD'S SUPPER. 12mo. 1d.

GOD FATHERS AND GOD MOTHERS. 1d.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF TRUTH. Nos. 1—18, each 2d.

BY REV. W. DE BURGH.

LECTURES on the SECOND ADVENT. 5s.

ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST. 1s. 6d.

FOUR SERMONS on the SECOND ADVENT. 1s. 6d.

SIX DISCOURSES on the Nature and Influence of Faith. 2s.

TRACTS FOR THE CHURCH, 1st and 2nd Series. 8d.

REDEMPTION of the WORLD, and ELECTION of the CHURCH. 1s. 6d.

BY REV. W. URWICK, D.D.

THE TRIPLE CROWN; or the POWER, COURSE, AND DOOM of the PAPACY. Handsome cloth, 5s.

"One of the most complete and impartial examinations we have seen of the claims put forward by the Church of Rome."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"Handled with vast ability. No work in our language has so exclusively exposed the Papacy."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST, the Blessed Hope of the Church. Royal 12mo. cloth, 5s.

THE SAVIOUR'S RIGHT TO DIVINE WORSHIP VINDICATED. Royal 12mo. cloth, 8s. 6d.

VALUE AND CLAIMS OF THE SCRIPTURES, and Reasons of Separation from the Church of Rome. sewed 1s.; cloth, 1s. 6d.

BY REV. J. D. SMITH.

A VOICE FROM THE ALPS; or the Vaudois Valleys. Cloth, 3s.

CONNEMARA PAST AND PRESENT: its Scenery, History, &c. Cl. 2s.

THE RHINE AND THE REFORMATION; or Europe Past and Present. Cloth, 2s.

OLIVER CROMWELL; or England in the Past, viewed in Relation to England in the Present. Cloth boards, 1s.

BY CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH.

SECOND CAUSES; or, UP AND BE DOING. Fcp. 8vo. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

SKETCHES OF IRISH HISTORY, Antiquities, Religion, Customs, and Manners; with Preface by Charlotte Elizabeth; adapted for the Young and for Families, with map and plates, 5s.

THE INVALID'S HYMN BOOK, with Introductory Preface by the Rev. Hugh White, A.M. Thirteenth Thousand. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

ROSA, THE WORK-GIRL. By the Author of "The Irish Dove," "Fisherman's Daughter." With Engravings. Cloth, 1s.

THE IRISH DOVE; or Faults on Both Sides. A Tale. Cloth, 5s.

BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.

THE YOUNG INSTRUCTED IN THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. Being a harmony and continuous History of the Life of our Lord and his Apostles, Sketches of Old Testament History, Biography, Manners and Customs of Jews, &c. With Preface by Rev. Thomas Drew, D.D. Maps, &c. 18mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

KATE CONNOR; or, a Text for All Things. By Sidney O. Moore, Author of "The Voice of the New Year." Second Edition revised. 4d.

THE FATAL LIE. By Sidney O. Moore. Second Edition, 32mo. 2d.

THE INFANT SCHOOL BOOK; being Questions and Answers on the Doctrines of the Christian Religion, adapted for Families and Infant Schools. New Edition enlarged, 2d.

GEOGRAPHY FOR CHILDREN. By Groves. Twelfth Edition, revised and enlarged, 8d. "Simple and comprehensive."

A FIRST SET OF PRAYERS FOR CHILDREN. By Mrs. Cleaver. 2d.
A SECOND SET. 4d.; together, 5d.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND CATECHISM, with Proofs. 1d.

WATTS' FIRST CATECHISM, with Prayers for Children, &c. 1d.

LITTLE GEORGINA; or Conversations for Children. By the Author of "Three Years in Italy." 18mo. cloth, 1s.

BIBLE STORIES FOR VERY LITTLE CHILDREN. By the Author of "The Young Instructed." With wood engravings. 2 vols. 3s.

STORIES FOR CHILDREN. 32mo. cloth, 1s.

THE HAPPY FAMILY; a History for Children. By the Author of "The Sympathy of Jesus." 18mo. 3d.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "GLORY, GLORY."

THE INCONSISTENT PHARISEE; or the Story of Betsey. A true Narrative. 18mo. 4d.

THE BROKEN PLEDGE. 18mo. 4d.

THE EARLY ROSES. 32mo. 1d.



